12-1962

Correlates of administrative behavior and organizational climate

Phyllis U. Coker
University of Tennessee

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Phyllis U. Coker entitled "Correlates of administrative behavior and organizational climate." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Orin B. Graff, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

December 6, 1962

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Phyllis U. Coker entitled "Correlates of Administrative Behavior and Organizational Climate." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Dean of the Graduate School

CORRELATES OF ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Graduate Council of

The University of Tennessee

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

Phyllis U. Coker

December 1962

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to the many people who have made the completion of this study possible. A debt of gratitude is owed the Delta Kappa Gamma organization for a generous scholarship and the support of many of its individual members. Sincere gratitude is expressed to those colleagues in the Knox County Schools System and in the Tennessee State Department of Education whose encouragement and support have been invaluable and to Dr. Andrew W. Halpin who so graciously supplied a portion of the data utilized.

Sincere appreciation is extended members of the writer's doctoral committee: Dr. Orin B. Graff, Chairman, Dr. Howard F. Aldmon, Dr. Gerald H. Whitlock, Dr. Travis L. Hawk, Dr. John W. Gilliland, and Dr. Edward S. Christenbury.

Special thanks are due Dr. Orin Graff who as chairman has been a friend, an inspiration, and an excellent counselor throughout graduate study. Dr. Gerald Whitlock's patience, tolerance, and very capable assistance during many hours given of his time helped make the completion of this study possible. To him the writer owes a special debt of gratitude.

This study is dedicated to the writer's daughter Carole and her son Sherril, without whose patience and understanding this goal would have been difficult to achieve; also to her late mother "Miss Pearl" whose unending encouragement was an inspiration through many years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Education in America finds its challenge in the following quotation:

> The paramount goal of the United States was set long ago. It is to guard the rights of the individual, to ensure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity.[1]

These statements constituting the first two sentences of the introduction to Goals for Americans are fraught with significance for all phases of education. The central focus of the present study is no exception. It is important that the organizational climate within a school foster such a goal and that the administrator attach maximum importance to such an objective. Otherwise, there will be created a situation devoid of the strength of real democratic endeavor.

Robert Fisk[2] points out the very obvious requirement that within a school system must be the provision of a structure within which the objectives of the educational program are attainable. This requirement is no less important for an individual school, because in the same way structure must be provided for the attainment of goals set within this

---

[1] Goals for Americans, The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 1.

[2] Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (eds.), Administrative Behavior in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 219.

school. If this structure is to be more than a fertile field for organizational manipulations, it must reflect an organizational climate conducive to individuals working willingly, eagerly, and dependably toward common goals.

Russell Gregg[3] believes that administrative behavior is an important factor in effective organizations of all kinds. He contends that the behavior of the administrator probably is, or should be, the crucial energizing force in all the cooperative efforts of people.

The organizational climate of a school permeates every classroom and, either positively or negatively, influences the teaching-learning situation therein. The recognition of this factor obligates the principal to some action in the development of such a climate.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of the present study centered on the identification of "Correlates of Administrative Behavior and Organizational Climate" and sought (1) to determine the relationship between the administrative behavior of an elementary school principal (as assessed by the instruments--the Tennessee Rating Guide, 1961 Edition, and the Tennessee Rating Guide: Adjectival Checklist) and the ranking of his school on overall morale, (2) to determine the relationship between the organizational climate of his school (as assessed by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III) and the ranking of his school on overall morale, and (3) to determine the relationship between the two instruments.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 269.

III. SUB-PROBLEMS

To facilitate such investigation and to achieve the purpose, certain sub-problems were perceived as necessary tasks; namely:

1. To estimate item validity for both the Tennessee Rating Guide, 1961 Edition, and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III.

2. To test the hypothesized equivalence of the Tennessee Rating Guide, 1961 Edition, and the Tennessee Rating Guide: Adjectival Check-list, and to arrive at estimates of their reliability, as well as the reliability of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III.

3. To determine the relationship between a modified scoring procedure and the traditional scoring procedure which had been used to score the instruments.

IV. ASSUMPTIONS

1. Teacher morale is a function of the organizational climate of the school.

2. The quality of the organizational climate of a school can be estimated from scores on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions applied in this study:

Administrative behavior. Behavior judged to result in either

effective or ineffective administrative performance.

Organizational climate and/or morale. That prevailing "tone" or mood which reflects the degree of willingness and eagerness on the part of a school staff to work dependably and cooperatively toward common well-defined goals.

Climate item. Statement of behavior and circumstance assumed to contribute in some degree to a positive or negative organizational climate within a school.

Elementary school. A school encompassing grades one through eight.

Principal. An elementary school administrator whose official duties are entirely administrative and supervisory in nature.

VI. GENERAL BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In September, 1959, a federally supported research project entitled "Organizational Climate of Schools" was implemented by the University of Utah's Bureau of Educational Research under the direction of Professor Andrew W. Halpin.[4] Under contractual arrangements of the grant, the investigation was aimed at developing criteria and a resultant "personality profile" scale for evaluating an organization. The organization

---

[4]Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Projects Initiated Under the Cooperative Research Branch, July 1, 1956-September 20, 1960, No. 543 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 19.

was defined as a school, and the "climate" denoted symptomatic manifestations as perceived by a school's administrator and staff collectively. The market has abounded with scales purporting to measure the personality of individuals, but there existed a dearth of instruments with which to assess a school's "personality."

Pursuant to verbal discussions and plans made during a phone call from Halpin to Professor Orin B. Graff, Head of the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, College of Education, The University of Tennessee, a formal request by mail was made from Utah to Graff requesting local participation in the unique research endeavor.[5]

Specifically, the request specified data on a sample of ten elementary schools adjudged to be of heterogeneous characteristics relating to elements of morale. The research phase in which The University of Tennessee participated was that of final standardization and validation steps and involved the utilization of Form III of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. In part, the arrangements between the two universities precipitated the present study. Halpin had stated in his letter to Graff:

> We have worked out several dimension scores for the questionnaire and hope to be able to develop a profile from these scores for describing the climate . . . . In addition, if you, or the graduate student would be interested, we would be happy to have punched for you a duplicate set of cards which can provide a rich source of data for subsequent dissertations in your department.[6]

---

[5]Letter from Andrew W. Halpin, University of Utah, to Orin B. Graff, The University of Tennessee, April 14, 1961.

[6]Ibid.

Robert B. Smawley, at the time a graduate student in educational administration at The University of Tennessee, was designated by Graff to assume the responsibility for the collection of the data requested by Halpin. In turn, Graff secured permission from the superintendent of a local school system to obtain the data from selected schools within the system. The writer, at the time, was a supervisor of instruction within the selected school system and was designated to aid Smawley in procuring the data.

The interest of the writer in the possibility of using the locally collected data in a local research project stemmed from two sources: namely, past experience as supervisor of instruction in a local school system and participation in 1956 in a phase of the research at The University of Tennessee, involving the Tennessee Rating Guide.[7] These experiences served to make the possibility of a study, purporting to assess the relationship between the "organizational climate" of a school and the administrative behavior of its principal an intriguing one.

A request was made by Smawley to Halpin for a duplicate set of cards constituting the data sent to him from The University of Tennessee area. Halpin stated in his reply to Smawley:

> We shall, of course, be glad to send a duplicate set of cards for the county curriculum supervisor who hopes to use the material for her research.[8]

---

[7]Phyllis U. Coker, "A Study of the Use of The Tennessee Rating Guide As a Means of Differentiating Between Effective and Ineffective School Administrators" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1956).

[8]Letter from Andrew W. Halpin, University of Utah, to Robert B. Smawley, The University of Tennessee, April 27, 1961.

The above recounting of agreements between the personnel of the two universities establishes the origin of the present study. It originated in the University of Utah Research Project involving the "organizational climate" of schools. At the time of the initiation of the present study, the parent study was incomplete and no findings were available. The major portion of the present study was done with only a very general knowledge of the Utah Research Project. However, before the conclusion of the present study, the first phase of the Project[9] was released. Therefore, some of the data from this initial phase of the Project, pertinent to both Form III and Form IV of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, were utilized in the present study. Form IV was the final form utilized in the first phase of the Utah Project.

Smawley[10] had found many instruments which had been made available for appraising the school administrator. Pertinent to the present study he had also analyzed, converted, and refined The University of Tennessee's own Tennessee Rating Guide (TRG) to include two forms. An adjectival checklist form of the TRG modeled over Osgood's Semantic Differential was coupled to an abbreviated descriptive rating form of the TRG. The two forms were hypothetically equivalent, but they were recommended to be

---

[9]Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools" (unpublished research report performed at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pursuant to Contract No. SAE 543 [8639] with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962).

[10]Robert B. Smawley, "Typal Sets and Syndromes of Administrative Behavior" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1961).

applied together for maximum reliability. However, there still existed the need for an instrument to appraise the school wherein the administrator practiced. Hence, the importance of the Utah Project and rationale for the present research became clear.

Such an instrument might become an extremely valuable correlate with the revised (1961) Tennessee Rating Guide, and the former might also be used as an excellent tool with which to sharpen school surveys. The Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, The University of Tennessee, has conducted many such surveys upon request in the past and could profitably employ such a new scale.

VII. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to ten selected elementary schools in a county school system located in East Tennessee. Two hundred and three teaching personnel, including ten principals, plus four system-wide supervisory personnel participated.

VIII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The introduction, statement of the problem, sub-problems, assumptions, definition of terms, general background and significance of the study, limitations, and organization of the study are included in Chapter I.

Related literature with reference to both industry and education is presented in Chapter II.

The instruments and the methodology used are described in Chapter III.

The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV.

A discussion of the results of the study is included in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

For a number of years industry has been concerned with the relation of personnel and work output. Education has been much slower than industry in recognizing the influence and value of morale, and a much greater portion of the research has been done for industry. However, during the past few years, many vital educational problems have been attributed to poor morale, and educators have turned to research for some possible solutions.

During the years in which research has focused on the elements of morale, the seeming intangibility and elusiveness of these elements at times have been frustrating. Needless to say, the identification and assessment of these elements have been difficult. However, in the literature there is evidence of continued endeavor toward a more adequate identification and assessment of such factors.

Haire described aptly the problem of surveying the literature pertaining to morale:

> There is probably no other field in the general area of social psychological problems in industry in which there are so many publications as there are under the heading of morale. The number of independent measurements of the state of morale in different situations and with different instruments are legion, and it has become necessary to fall back on a biennial bibliography simply to keep abreast of those reported in professional journals.[1]

---

[1]Mason Haire, "Industrial Social Psychology," Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II, by Gardner Lindzey (ed.) (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), pp. 1104-124.

Notwithstanding the above statement, there seems to be difficulty in defining a concept of morale. Halpin characterized the word "morale" as an emotionally charged term that means quite different things to different people.[2] "Morale" has been an abused word. It has been attached to baseball; sermons; night clubs; red, white, and blue posters; uniforms; vitamin pills; morning calisthenics; enemy atrocities; and many other activities, on the ground that these were "morale builders."[3] No one doubts the basic importance of morale, but the term itself has threatened to become a national, or perhaps an international, conversational cliché.

Because of the abundance of the material concerning morale, it became necessary to establish some points of relevance in terms of the present study. This relevance seemed to be characterized by the following emphases: (1) the development of a concept of morale and (2) the relationship between administrative behavior and organizational climate and/or morale. The first assumed importance because of the necessity for formulating a concept of morale acceptable to this study. The latter emphasis was pertinent because of the nature of the two instruments utilized in the present study, one having to do with organizational climate and the other with administrative behavior, per se. The related literature was

---

[2]Andrew W. Halpin, "A Paradigm for Research on Administrative Behavior," Administrative Behavior in Education by Campbell and Gregg (eds.) (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957), p. 165.

[3]Goodwin Watson (ed.), Civilian Morale, Second Yearbook of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (New York: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1942), p. v.

noted or summarized as it seemed appropriate to illustrate or support these two emphases.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CONCEPT OF MORALE

"Morale" has run the gamut in concept--from the ebullient, emotional, flag-waving spectacle occasioned by declarations of war between nations, or a "Big-Ten" football game, to the more sobering tenacity and cohesiveness inspired by a common goal, even when the "chips are down." The development of a concept of morale does not lend itself to a sequential step-by-step procedure with clearly defined differentiations marking its progress. Rather, it consists, in the main, of the recognition that morale is not uni-dimensional but rather multi-dimensional and possessed of components each seeking its "place in the sun" in any given situation.

The term "morale" is a relatively new one in American life in that it came into use in this country in 1917-18 as a result of World War I. Hocking's observations during this war, in terms of army morale, revealed some insights that seem important. He decried the fact that morale had been identified with the emotionalism dwelt on by psychologists of the "crowd," and made synonymous with good spirits and enthusiasm. As he observed the army's reactions, it was in the delays, tediums, and casualties which had lost their exclamatory value and had fallen into the sullen routine of the day's work that the more vital dimensions of morale were revealed.[4] A common purpose among the armed forces seemed of paramount

---

[4]William E. Hocking, Morale and Its Enemies (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918), pp. 14-16.

importance. Hall, a few years later, recognized this same importance of an individual's "sense of solidarity with his comrades seeking the same end and enabling him either to do or suffer in a common cause."[5] Hall believed that morale was a condition which could be trained for and cultivated. In his writing in 1920, he asserted that such conditioning in every field was one of the greatest demands facing modern civilization.[6]

Hall also agreed with Hocking's concept that:

> . . . good morale is the condition of the inner man; the state of will in which you can get the most from the machinery, deliver blows with the greatest effect, take blows with the least depression, and hold out for the longest time.[7]

This concept was born of war times, but its proponents believed it not an evanescent one in terms of civilian morale.

One of the next conceptual variations which seemed worthy of note was the emphasis placed upon the role of values by Watson. He maintained that morale, which is that element having to do with individual attitude in group endeavor, must include three basic ingredients: (1) the possession by the individual of a solid set of convictions and values which for him make life worth living, (2) the awareness of the individual of tasks which he must carry through, of problems that he must solve in order to defend and extend his store of values, and (3) in times of common peril there must be an essential harmony between the values and aims of the

---

[5] G. Stanley Hall, Morale, the Supreme Standard of Life and Conduct (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1920), p. 23.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Hocking, op. cit., p. 14.

individual and those of his group. Watson also attributed multiple meanings to the term "morale" and used it to describe what people do rather than the way they feel.[8] At approximately the same time of Watson's writing, during World War II, Nash posited two salient characteristics of morale which were: (1) "morale" of itself does not have qualitative significance but morale for what is the pertinent question; and (2) the pattern for morale building remains the same through generations, but the material for the building is variant. He also reaffirmed the importance of unity of purpose as an ingredient of morale.[9]

In 1944 Kurtz defined morale as the physical, mental, and spiritual fitness that demands release in action against the recognized objective.[10] MacCurdy contended that morale that is "either strikingly good or glaringly bad means that there is unanimity of action in the group which is exhibiting gallantry or cowardice."[11] MacCurdy also recognized the variability of morale in that in his war-time writing he noted that each country had its own type of morale, with aspects in which it was strong and points at which it was peculiarly vulnerable. The above two concepts are couched in a military context but have relevance also in an educational and industrial context. In this same year the yearbook of

---

[8]Watson, op. cit., p. 4.

[9]Jay B. Nash, Building Morale (New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1942), pp. v and 113.

[10]Le R. H. Kurtz, "The Morale Function of the Executive," Personnel, XX (April, 1944), 202-20.

[11]J. T. MacCurdy, The Structure of Morale (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944), p. 62.

the American Association of School Administrators was devoted entirely to "morale for a free world" and was written on the premise that "morale is more than tenacity, but it is also a state of mind which maintains each individual as an effective working member of the group."[12]

In the writing of Ghiselli and Brown there was an implication that, in the industrial thinking for a period of years, motivation and morale seem to have been equated. However, the growing awareness of the complexity of the factors influencing a multi-dimensional morale was also noted. This was indicated by the authors' statement that:

> . . . the interactions among motives, conditions of work and various aspects of the social milieu are far more important in the determination of human behavior in the industrial situation than any single motivating, environmental or social condition.[13]

Shilland lends support to the multi-dimensional premise in that he defines morale as a "series of attitudes that influence one toward a given situation with the objective of 'being at home' in that situation."[14] French, writing about this same period, listed some manifestations representative of high morale such as agreement on objectives, a high degree of cohesiveness, etc. He then presented a notion that seems to increase in emphasis throughout the literature. This notion was that these manifestations represent high morale only if a relationship to goal achievement can be shown.[15]

---

[12] Ibid.

[13] Edwin E. Ghiselli and Clarence W. Brown, Personnel and Industrial Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948), p. 434.

[14] P. D. Shilland, "Teacher Morale Survey," Educational Forum, XIII (May, 1949), 479-86.

[15] R. L. French, "Morale and Leadership," Human Factors in Undersea Warfare (Washington, D. C.: National Research Council, Committee on

In 1953, Viteles, writing of morale in industry, contended that the term itself had been used loosely both by industrial management and by psychologists. He stated that in many instances it had been used as equivalent to intrinsic job satisfaction, but that it had become increasingly evident that morale consisted of a number of dimensions. He supported the concept which defines morale as an "attitude of satisfaction with, desire to continue in, and willingness to strive for the goals of a particular group or organization."[16] Satlow, at approximately the same time, writing about the "morale quotient--MQ" of a department, characterized it as an intangible but nonetheless pervasive force. He named it as the end product of conditions and relations that characterize a department.[17] Viteles and Satlow, contemporary writers interested in separate fields, seemed to have no major conflict in their concepts of morale.

In some representative writings during the period 1956-1962 were reflected some prevalent notions about morale. In 1959 Whitlock reviewed and made a critical analysis of attempts at morale measurement. Among his conclusions were the following, pertaining to the scope and dimension of morale:

1. The scope of the morale concept transcends the immediate job

---

Undersea Warfare, 1949), p. 465, citing Daniel Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1956), p. 161.

[16]Morris S. Viteles, Motivation and Morale in Industry (New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1953), p. 12.

[17]David Satlow, "What Is Your Departmental MQ (Morale Quotient)?" Journal of Educational Sociology, XXVII (March, 1954), 329-32.

situation and must be taken to include consideration of the psychological environment as well as the physical environment.

2. A fair degree of agreement exists as to the general scope of "morale" among different investigators using different questionnaires, different groups, a priori determined factors, and factorially determined factors.

3. A low degree of agreement exists among investigators as to the number of dimensions of morale.[18]

Anderson, in the educational field, asserted that:

> . . . anyone acquainted with schools and school facilities does not have to be in a building very long before he can sense the morale in the faculty group. There is a certain good feeling, a sense of joy in their work, a unity of purpose, and a liking for each other that goes to make up what is known as morale.[19]

Baehr and Renck, concerning industrial morale, reaffirmed the idea that the aligning of employee group goals with those of management would result in desirable, beneficial, and positive effects on productivity. These authors also noted the recognition of the greater complexity involved in the dimensions of morale.[20] During this same time Halpin reflected that with all that has been written concerning morale, it remains difficult

---

[18]Gerald H. Whitlock, "The Status of Morale Measurement, 1959" (San Antonio, Texas: Personnel Laboratory, Wright Air Development Division, Air Research and Development Command, USAF, Lackland AFB, June, 1960).

[19]Vernon E. Anderson, Principles and Procedures of Curriculum Improvement (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956), p. 161.

[20]M. E. Baehr and Richard Renck, "The Definition and Measurement of Employee Morale," Administrative Science Quarterly, III (September, 1958).

to determine just what it means.[21]

In 1962 Faulk, discussing the improvement of staff morale, suggested an almost all-inclusive concept of morale in that he termed it a natural outgrowth of all the conditions surrounding a person's work. These included financial and professional security, a feeling of belonging, recognition of work well done, pleasant working conditions, a voice in formulating policies, impartial treatment for all, and a feeling of importance on the job.[22]

Perhaps one of the simpler, more direct, and yet comprehensive concepts of morale is reflected in the following excerpt from the writings of Robert Roy as he discussed organization and morale:

> Morale may be defined as the degree to which organization goals and goals of the individuals who comprise organization are compatible, to such an extent as these goals have common ground. Poor morale may be described accurately as a condition of incompatibility in individual and organization goals but, conversely, good morale requires more than compatibility alone. It also requires the individual pursuit of organization goals with enthusiasm and energy. Passive, apathetic or indifferent acquiescence to organization goals can only describe a condition of indifferent morale.[23]

Perhaps the treatment of morale which deviated the greatest from the major concepts which have developed in America since 1918 is the one subscribed to by Ralph M. Stogdill in his discussion of individual behavior and group achievement. His attention to morale is a facet of his

---

[21]Halpin, op. cit.

[22]Harry R. Faulk, "Improving Staff Morale," Overview, III (February, 1962), 62.

[23]Robert H. Roy, The Administrative Process (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1958), p. 144.

endeavor to develop a theory of group achievement.[24] The hypothesis of a stable, positive relationship between differences in member satisfaction, group morale, group integration and other less well-defined factors, and productivity had been challenged.[25] Whitlock and Cureton in a recent study reinforced the position that morale bears no direct relation to productivity. Rather, morale is now considered an output along with productivity.[26]

For this reason Stogdill was unable to construct a consistent theory based on the hypothesis that productivity is the only achievement of organization. Although Stogdill's theory is more closely allied with industrial research, it seems highly probable that it has relevance for educational research. It appears to be indicative of a deeper probing into the elements of morale and the attainment of a higher level of sophistication in industrial research than has been reached at this point in the major portion of educational research. Because of its deviation from the usual perspective in which morale is placed, a summary of this theory of group achievement appears pertinent:

> This theory proposed that the essential dimensions of organization achievement are productivity, morale, and integration. Group productivity is defined as the degree of change in expectancy values

---

[24]Ralph M. Stogdill, Individual Behavior and Group Achievement (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959).

[25]A. H. Brayfield and W. H. Crockett, "Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance," Psychological Bulletin, LII (1955), 396-424.

[26]Gerald H. Whitlock and E. E. Cureton, "Validation of Morale and Attitude Scales" (San Antonio, Texas: Personnel Laboratory, Wright Air Development Division, Air Research and Development Command, USAF, Lackland AFB, June, 1960).

> created by the group operations. Group integration is defined as the extent to which the structure and operations are capable of being maintained under stress. Group morale is defined as the degree of freedom from restraint in action toward a goal. These elements of group achievement may vary from little to much. Morale, for example, is not defined as "good morale," but as a characteristic which can vary over a wide range of values.[27]

This concept is very dissimilar to the earlier research identification of group morale with group integration. A recent discussion by Thompson concerning "organizational conflict" implied an additional conceptual notion in terms of morale. For the most part a situation, or group, permeated with high morale is considered as one supposedly free from conflict. Thompson's notion was that conflict is not to be avoided or eliminated but to be managed. The basic techniques of such management are determining factors in establishing a morale climate.[28]

As these various concepts, or conceptual revisions, of morale have been reviewed, it is obvious that some basic components have varied little. The trend from a very simple positive definition to a multi-dimensional concept of increasing complexity has kept almost intact such components. The probability of other revisions is recognized and expected. However, for the purpose of the present study, a rather simple, direct concept is accepted. This concept reflects the willingness and eagerness on the part of a staff to work cooperatively and dependably toward common goals.

---

[27] Stogdill, op. cit., p. 198.

[28] J. D. Thompson, "A Model for Viewing Organizational Conflict" (paper read at the University of North Carolina Research Seminar, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, April 11, 1961). (Mimeographed.)

III. ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR--ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND/OR MORALE

An organizational climate conducive to strong morale is not likely to be achieved by chance. Earlier in this chapter it has been postulated that no one society or nation is the sole possessor of high morale. This postulate implies that for some nations and for some people, a state of high morale may be achieved within an autocratic environment; for others, because of a different orientation, a democratic context is a necessity. Since the present study has its setting within a democracy and involves a people who have for generations placed a high premium upon democratic principles, the importance of a democratic environment is assumed. The major portion of the literature reviewed in this section is based upon this assumption. Critzer stated this assumption as: The best morale can only exist in an environment of democracy in which each person has worth as an individual.[29]

Industrial research has given increasing emphasis to supervisor-employee relationships as an important factor in organization. A parallel emphasis in educational research is found in the increasing attention given to administrator-teacher relationships as a major influence in determining the organizational climate of a school. Grant summarized an attitude of industry toward this relationship.

> Both experimental studies and employee-attitude surveys provide convincing evidence that the quality of supervision is a major factor

---

[29]Leon A. Critzer and Ralph V. Backman, "How May the Principal and the Faculty Promote Wholesome School Morale?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XL (April, 1956), 234-35.

> in stimulating production, influencing attitudes, and in satisfying the needs of workers. The statement, by one worker, that "morale is the treatment I get from the boss" summarizes a not uncommon employee attitude toward supervision. Recognition of this situation by management is apparently found in oft-repeated assertions that the supervisor or foreman is the "key man" in industry, the "cutting edge" of management or management's "right-hand man."[30]

In a discussion of human relations in educational organization, Hughes pointed up a noticeable inadequacy on the part of some educators:

> Those of us who are associated directly with educational organizations acknowledge our responsibility to see that the pupils and students in our schools receive the richest, most fruitful experience it is within our power to offer . . . . What is not so readily acknowledged is that the quality of morale, the degree of group unity, and the kind of relationships which exist among those who participate in the school are significant factors in determining how fruitful and rich an experience we can offer our pupils and students. These factors help determine the quality of educational achievement.[31]

Notwithstanding the failure on the part of some educators to recognize these significant factors, the literature indicates an increasing awareness on the part of many educators as to their importance. With this awareness comes also the recognition of the significance of staff relations and the importance of the role of the administrator. Early school administration showed little concern for improving staff relations within a school. This lack of concern is summarized by Miller in the following:

> Promoting good staff relations in schools was rather unheard of in early school administration. The relationship of staff to administrator was usually one of independence. There was direction, but it was authoritarian and very dogmatic.[32]

---

[30]E. S. Grant, "Let the Foreman Manage," Connecticut Industry (January, 1945), citing Viteles, op. cit., p. 444.

[31]James M. Hughes, Human Relations in Educational Organization (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957), p. 1.

[32]George E. Miller, "What Is the Role of the Principal in Promoting Good Relationships With and Among the Staff?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (April, 1960), 19.

This early notion has been replaced in the theory of educational administration due to the fact that during the past several years the whole concept of leadership has changed. The organizational climate of a school has assumed increasing importance, and the principal's role in its development has been one of increasing responsibility. This newer concept was supported by Backman in his contention that "wholesome morale is the end result of a cooperative undertaking requiring reciprocal support and understanding, but the leadership rests with the principal."[33] McKimmie believes that the nucleus in the creation of wholesome morale is the understanding that both teachers and administrators must be involved in the processes of understanding and participation. He also believes it essential for the principal to be able and willing to accept the responsibility for leadership.[34] Lowe maintained that once the administrator assumes responsibility for the improvement of staff morale, there are certain positive steps that can be taken.[35]

Before any logical assessment of morale is made, much research needs to be done pertaining to the identification of the elements of morale. Jones asserted that "to provide a state of high morale on the part of teachers, certain identifiable elements or conditions must be

---

[33]Critzer and Backman, op. cit.

[34]Alexander A. McKimmie, Jr., "In What Ways May the Principal and the Faculty Promote Wholesome School Morale?" National Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLI (April, 1957), 39-43.

[35]Joe Lowe, "5 Steps to Higher Staff Morale," School Executive, LXXXIV (September, 1954), 54.

present."[36] Perhaps the greater number of studies in the educational field has had to do with this identification rather than the actual assessment or measurement of morale. Studies of this nature have relevance to the present study only in that a large portion of the elements or conditions identified is either directly or indirectly influenced by the principal. This being true, such studies lend support to the major assumption of the present study. A number of such surveys were reviewed. In noting such research, mention is made only of the findings which support the significance of the relationship of the administrator to the organizational climate of his school.

The most frequently mentioned item in contributing to teachers' high morale, as reported in a survey by Gragg, was "confidence in the leadership of the principal and other administrators."[37] Harap in summarizing a study of returns from surveys conducted in twenty school systems found the most common causes of poor morale were in this order: (1) inadequate salaries, (2) large classes, and (3) poor administration.[38] Out of the fourteen conclusions stated, following a study by Byrnes, three reasons for poor morale seemed to be pertinent: (1) over half the faculty functions dominated by the principal, (2) faculty meetings

---

[36]James J. Jones, "Teacher Morale and Administration," Clearing House, XXXII (January, 1958), 291.

[37]W. L. Gragg, "Teacher Morale," Clearing House, XXIX (April, 1955), 494.

[38]Henry Harap, "Morale," Nations Schools, LXIII (June, 1949), 55-57.

uninteresting, and (3) type of supervision not desirable.[39]

The analysis of certain school factors inherent in a specific school system was the focus of a study by Noble. This analysis was an attempt to determine the factors which teachers believe affect teacher morale. The findings of this study reflected clearly a high degree of influence of administrative behavior on teacher morale.[40] Faulk,[41] Hedlund and Brown,[42] and Lindner[43] made similar surveys aimed at the identification of factors influencing staff morale. In these three surveys the major portion of the identified factors was directly influenced by the principal.

O'Connor's survey of a number of schools, in relation to morale factors, produced some findings which seemed worthy of note. These findings revealed that none of the schools surveyed could clearly be classified as a high or low morale unit. Teachers' morale indexes varied in every school quite widely. However, the area of inquiry which showed

---

[39]Arthur F. Byrnes, "A Study of Job Satisfactions and Dissatisfactions of Teachers in Selected Schools of Indiana" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York, 1951).

[40]Warren V. Noble, "A Study of School Personnel Factors Which Teachers Believe Affect Teacher Morale in One School System" (unpublished Project C Report for doctoral degree, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1959).

[41]Faulk, op. cit.

[42]Paul A. Hedlund and Foster H. Brown, "Conditions That Lower Teacher Morale," Nations Schools, XLVIII (September, 1951), 40-42.

[43]Ivan H. Lindner, "The Secondary School Principal and Staff Morale," The American School Board Journal, CXXI (April, 1957), 25-27.

the most consistent relationship with the overall level of morale was the way in which the teacher felt about his superior or administrator.[44]

A number of studies were focused more directly upon the principal's role in influencing organizational climate and/or morale. Freehill and Ross reported a study conducted jointly by the Psychological Services and Research Center of Western Washington College of Education and the Northwest Division of the Washington State Elementary Principals Association. The purpose of this study was to obtain a better understanding of how people perceive and interpret the duties and the behavior of the principal. Judgments or opinions of children, parents, and teachers were solicited. Some pertinent findings from teachers' responses were: (1) most important was the principal's helping teachers to know whether or not they were doing a good job, (2) teachers valued the principal's capacity to understand the broad objectives of a total school program, and (3) teachers valued principals who were cautious and democratic in making changes.[45]

Hand conducted a study involving approximately four hundred teachers, which was focused on the principal's role in staff morale. The respondents were divided into a "high morale group" and a "low morale group." The findings indicated, almost consistently, a higher degree of

---

[44]William F. O'Connor, Jr., "A Study of Some Selected Factors Related to Teacher Morale" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, New York, 1958).

[45]Maurice F. Freehill and J. Alan Ross, "The Elementary School Principal As Others See Him," The Elementary School Journal, LXI (October, 1960), 35-40.

satisfaction with administrator-teacher relationships in the "high morale group."[46]

Smith studied the relationship of administrative policies and practices and teaching efficiency. The findings indicated that one of the four areas apparently having most influence on teaching efficiency was "the means for fostering harmonious relationships between the teaching and administrative staffs."[47] Silverman's attempt to identify specific personal characteristics and daily activities of a group of elementary school principals, which might influence teacher morale, resulted in the conclusion that practically everything about a principal's behavior was influential. The statistical analyses also indicated that a principal's personality and human relations contacts had more of an effect on teacher morale than any or all other characteristics.[48]

A different approach in the study of morale was made by Shipnuck. He attempted to analyze the hostility exhibited in the behavior of elementary school principals. The assumption was that the principal played a crucial role in influencing faculty morale and that the interpersonal relations conducive to morale would be impaired if the teachers perceived hostility in the principals. One of the major findings derived from this

---

[46]Harold C. Hand, "What Makes for High Teacher Morale?" Educational Leadership, V (January, 1948), 279-80.

[47]Wilbur Smith, "Administrative Policies and Practices and Their Relation to Teaching Efficiency" (unpublished Project Report for doctoral degree, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1953).

[48]Martin Silverman, "Principals--What Are You Doing To Teacher Morale?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIII (March, 1957), 204-10.

study was that the principal who is best off in terms of teachers' perceptions of low hostility and high faculty morale is the principal who sees himself as his teachers see him, but with a tendency to rate himself as more hostile than his teachers rate him.[49]

Two studies by Cornell and Padgug have perhaps more relevance for the present study and merit a more detailed discussion.

Cornell, in his study of socially perceptive administration, defines a socially perceptive administrator as:

> . . . one who <u>understands</u> the behavior of persons in the organization in their relationships with himself and with one another, including the less tangible, less overt aspects of attitude, feeling, and motivation.[50]

This study included four school systems and the questions raised were:

1. Are school systems of similar level of development measurably different in administrative relationships?

2. Are there observable effects of various types of administrative climate upon teachers and their teaching?

The following variables of organizational climate were included in the study:

> A "teacher morale" measure, more specifically a measure of satisfaction of teachers with their relationships to the organization.
>
> Teachers' perception of the degree of deconcentration of administrative power in the school system.

---

[49]Murray E. Shipnuck, "Perceived Hostility in Administrator-Teacher Relationships" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1954).

[50]Francis G. Cornell, "Socially Perceptive Administration," <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, XXXVI (March, 1955), 219-23.

The extent to which teachers feel they are given responsibility when they participate in policy making.

The extent to which teachers feel that their contribution to policy making is taken into account in final decisions.

The extent to which teachers interact directly with administrative personnel with respect to general school problems.[51]

There were two significant findings derived from Cornell's study:

1. No two of the four school systems were alike in their organizational climate. The four systems appeared at first to be a homogeneous group, much alike on the surface, but later it was possible to discern decided differences in organizational climate.

2. The environment of administration (the climate or atmosphere of the organization) appeared to be more important than administrative activity.[52]

Padgug explored the relationship of the leader behavior of a principal and staff morale.[53] The leadership aspect of this study was limited to a consideration of the secondary school principal in one secondary school and the relationship of his leader behavior to the morale of his staff. More specifically, leader behavior, as used in this study, refers to the presence or absence of specific activities, practices, policies, and expressed or implied attitudes of the principal, as set forth in a list of criteria created for use as the basis for assessing leader

---

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Jacob B. Padgug, "Leader Behavior of the Principal and Staff Morale" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1959).

behavior. Collins' list[54] reorganized into eight categories of job performance was used for these criteria. The categories were as follows:

1. Consideration for individuals and sense of justice.

2. Involving people in planning and decision-making.

3. Working with staff toward professional development and growth.

4. Maintaining a clear and definite position in all matters.

5. Disposition toward improvement and desirable change in the school program and procedures.

6. Getting to know and understand the school's students.

7. Developing and maintaining a desirable relationship with the central office.

8. Discharging community responsibilities.

The findings of Padgug's study revealed an apparent relationship between some aspects of the principal's leader behavior and staff morale. The relationship seemed closer for categories 1, 2, and 7. It seems that through these categories dealing most specifically with his human relations role, the principal has exerted prime impact on staff morale. The fact that his skills in human relations outweighed his shortcomings in others was most apparent.[55]

IV. SUMMARY

Chapter II presented a review of literature related to the development of a concept of morale which was acceptable for use in the present

---

[54] Ibid., p. 10.

[55] Ibid.

study. Literature particularly applicable to the relationship of the administrator and the organizational climate and/or morale was also reviewed.

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTS INVESTIGATED AND METHODOLOGY USED

I. INTRODUCTION

The form of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide investigated in this study were developed for the purpose of assessing a phase of an overall school situation. While the instrument purporting to measure administrative behavior had undergone numerous revisions, the one for assessing the organizational climate of a school was of much more recent origin. The purpose of this chapter is to delineate each of the instruments as well as the methodology used in the investigation.

II. THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (OCDQ) FORM III

Description

This instrument was developed as a phase of the University of Utah's Research Project investigating the "organizational climate" of schools. A list of the items included in the instrument is found in the Appendix. It was an attempt to develop items which described the different ways in which people behaved or the various conditions under which they worked. In turn, such descriptive items were to be utilized in obtaining a portrait of the climate, or social environment, of the school as an organization. At the time of the initiation of the present study,

this instrument was in the final stages of development and standardization. However, the form used in the present study is not the final form utilized in the initial phase of the Utah Research Project. The form of the questionnaire used in the present study is designated as the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III, or OCDQ, Form III.

This instrument was possessed of rather novel design and format. A sample illustration of the format, including instructions to the respondents, is found in the Appendix. On four IBM mark-sense cards eighty "climate" descriptive items were provided; a fifth card presented five personal biographical entries, and the sixth card was one of instructions for the respondent. Each of the eighty "climate" items described an indicative behavior or condition that occurs within a school organization.

Administration

As initially requested by Halpin,[1] ten elementary schools within a local county school system were selected. Four system-wide supervisory personnel were asked to list fifteen elementary schools of more than ten teachers which would represent a wide range of differences as to staff morale. The sole criterion was heterogeneity in terms of elements of morale, with particular reference to the teaching staff. Elements of morale, in this instance, were perceived to be certain conditions and behaviors existent within a school which resulted in a positive or negative organizational climate within that school.

---

[1]Letter from Andrew W. Halpin, University of Utah, to Orin B. Graff, The University of Tennessee, April 14, 1961.

The selected group of ten schools was then adjudged by a jury, composed of these same four system-wide supervisory personnel, as meeting this criterion for selection. The schools were then ranked from high to low, one to ten, on the basis of school morale, particularly as it seemed to be reflected within the teaching staff. This ranking was as follows:

School	Rank
A	1
B	3
C	9
D	7
E	4
F	10
G	5
H	2
I	6
J	8

Through the means of an informal discussion among all members of the jury, a consensus for such ranking had been obtained. The reliability of a ranking by such a jury was assumed because of the nature and number of contacts of each member with the schools over a sufficiently long period of time. In this instance the period of contacts ranged from four to twelve years. The jury included: (1) a system-wide supervisor of instruction, (2) the supervisor of library and audio-visual materials and services, (3) the system-wide supervisor of the health and physical education program, and (4) a person serving in the dual capacity of administrative assistant in charge of personnel and as a system-wide supervisor of instruction.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), Form III, was administered to the 203 teaching personnel of the selected

schools, including the ten principals. The questionnaires were administered at each school by Smawley and the writer. Participants were told the purpose of the questionnaires. They were also informed that their school had been selected as one of a sample of ten elementary Tennessee schools to be included in the Utah Research Project. Respondents were then asked to complete the questionnaires independently without discussion and within no specified time limit. The time for completion by the majority of respondents was approximately twenty-five minutes. They were assured of anonymity and were asked not to write their names on the questionnaires.

The data obtained from the ten sample schools were sent to Halpin for inclusion in the final validation of the Utah instrument. Pursuant to the earlier agreement, a duplicate set of cards including these data was returned to the writer to be used in a local research project.

Method of Scoring

The approach used in the present study was basically different from the approach used in the Utah Research Project. This difference was reflected in the assumption that, to some degree, each of the eighty items included in the OCDQ, Form III, was a manifestation of organizational climate and made either a positive or negative contribution to staff morale. Because of this difference in approach, it was necessary to devise a different scheme for scoring the OCDQ, Form III. Each item in the Utah Project was coded as follows:

IBM	Scoring
6	1. Rarely occurs
7	2. Sometimes occurs
8	3. Often occurs
9	4. Very frequently occurs

This coding scheme made no provision for the inclusion of a differential between positive and negative items; hence, it was necessary to establish item weights as well as a method of scoring for reported frequency of occurrence of the item.

The initial task was the determination of which "climate" items were positive and which were negative in relation to the organizational climate of the school. This task was accomplished by the use of "expert" ratings. The eighty items included in the OCDQ, Form III, were listed, followed by a five-degree continuum from high to low represented by ++, +, 0, -, and --. Each item of the questionnaire was to be positioned on the continuum in terms of its influence upon the organizational climate of a school. Exact instructions to the respondents were given as follows:

> The following is a list of descriptive "climate items" which are assumed to contribute in some degree to a positive or negative organizational climate within a school. The climate items are to be positioned on a five-degree continuum, moving from those producing a very excellent organizational climate to those producing a very poor or unsatisfactory organizational climate.
>
> Place a check in the column under ++ if the item implies a <u>very excellent</u> organizational climate, and a check under -- if the item implies a <u>very poor</u> organizational climate. Check the items +, -, or 0 to indicate the degree to which an item moves toward a positive or negative organizational climate when neither extreme is implied.

This list was submitted to one hundred individuals for checking. The individuals checking the list included members of a graduate seminar in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, and members of four graduate classes in the College of Education at The University of Tennessee. Informal groups and individuals with teaching experience were also included.

The positions on the continuum were weighted as follows: ++ = 5, + = 4, 0 = 3, - = 2, and -- = 1. The mean and standard deviation for each item were computed. Ambiguous items and items having such a neutral position that they exerted little, if any, influence on organizational climate were excluded. These were items whose mean value fell between 2.5 and 3.5 and were considered as being non-indicative for the present study. Each of the remaining items was then designated either as a positive or as a negative item as it appeared to influence the organizational climate of a school. The items with a mean value of 3.51 or above were considered positive items, and those with a mean value of 2.49 or below were considered negative items and were given weights of +1 and -1, respectively.

An experimental method of scoring the OCDQ, Form III, was utilized. A positive item was scored +1 only if it was reported to "often occur" or "very frequently occur." Otherwise, it was scored zero. A negative item was scored -1 only if it was reported to "often occur" or "very frequently occur." Otherwise, it was scored zero. The rationale for this method of scoring was the assumption that "very frequently" and "often" indicated very definite occurrences of behavior and circumstances which could be amply observed.

An illustration of the scoring scheme devised for use in the present study is as follows:

1. (Positive item) The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.

0	Rarely occurs
0	Sometimes occurs
+1	Often occurs
+1	Very frequently occurs

2. (Negative item) Teachers socialize together in small select groups.

0 Rarely occurs
0 Sometimes occurs
-1 Often occurs
-1 Very frequently occurs

The revised list of "climate" items and the above scoring scheme were used as the bases for the major portion of the statistical analyses included in the present study. These analyses were based on total scores obtained from the OCDQ, Form III (the writer's revision in terms of sixty-six positive and negative items).

In the Utah Project total scores were not utilized. The eighty items of the OCDQ, Form III, were reduced to sixty-four items which comprised the final form, Form IV, of the questionnaire.[2] These sixty-four items were classified into eight subtests, a description of which is included in the Appendix. These subtests were, in turn, divided into two sets of four subtests each. The first set pertained to the teacher's behavior; the second, to the principal's behavior. In view of the fact that all the items included in the eight subtests of Form IV were also included in Form III, a relationship between the two was assumed. A list of the items that comprise the eight subtests of the OCDQ, indicating item numbers for both Form III and Form IV, also indicating negative items which were scored inversely, is found in the Appendix. The standard

---

[2]Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools" (unpublished research report performed at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pursuant to Contract No. SAE 543 [8639] with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962).

scores on each subtest for each of the ten schools included in the present study were utilized in a portion of the statistical analysis.

Estimate of Instrument Reliability

The best method of determining reliability in the case of ratings is to correlate the ratings given by equally competent judges. In the present study, however, this procedure was complicated by the fact that the judges (teachers) were rating different persons (principals). The teachers in each of the ten selected schools rated only the principal in that school. If, in this case, the assumption is made that one judge is as good as another, then it becomes possible to compute the reliability of the total rating for that principal, just as one would compute the reliability of a test given the average reliability of a single item. Instrument reliability was then estimated through a special intra-class correlation. This method involved first, the computing of the reliability of a single rating, then estimating the reliability of the average ratings through a special application of the Spearman-Brown formula.[3]

Estimate of Item Validity

Item validities for the OCDQ, Form III, were estimated by basing the analysis, as suggested by Kirkpatrick and Cureton, on high and low criterion groups.[4] Conventional high and low criterion group methods

---

[3]Robert L. Ebel, "Estimation of the Reliability of Ratings," Psychometrika, XVI (January-December, 1951), 407-24.

[4]James J. Kirkpatrick and Edward E. Cureton, "Simplified Tables for Item Analysis," Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIV (Winter, 1954), 709-14.

entail the computation of the percentages of correct responses to each item in the high and low groups. The modified procedures suggested by Kirkpatrick and Cureton uses fixed numbers of subjects in these groups and thus avoids the need to compute percentages.

Estimate of Instrument Validity

An estimate of instrument validity was obtained by computing the Spearman rank correlation between the initial ranking of schools by supervisors and the ranking by mean scores obtained for each school on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III; also, Spearman's rank correlation was computed between the initial ranking of schools by supervisors and the ranking by standard scores obtained for each school on each of the eight subtests of the OCDQ, Form IV.[5]

III. THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE (1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST)

Description

At the time the present study was initiated, ten doctoral and seven master's theses had used the Tennessee Rating Guide, either as the central focus or as an accessory such as the criterion of success or failure in studying variables pertinent to effective school administration. Copies of the two forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide, hereafter designated as the TRG, or Guide, which were utilized in this study are

---

[5]George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 179-81.

found in the Appendix. The entire series of studies with the Guide, including its initial development, has been one phase of a research project initiated by the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at The University of Tennessee and aimed at improving educational leadership for the Southeastern Region.[6]

The Tennessee Rating Guide, in its various forms, is an inventory of behavioral characteristics used to evaluate administrators. Implicit within the Guide is the assumption that such behavioral characteristics can be identified and stated and also that democratic leadership is more effective than other methods.[7]

Smawley's study,[8] utilizing the Guide, was the tenth in the series of such studies. The forms of the Guide which resulted from his refinement and revision are the forms which are utilized in the present study. One form (TRG, 1961 Edition) is the conventional Guide revised to a simplified form. This revision includes twenty item-scales as well as an additional item-scale (Number 21) which is a final, overall immediate criterion judgment of effectiveness. Coupled to this abbreviated descriptive rating was an adjectival checklist form of the Guide, modeled over

---

[6]The University of Tennessee, College of Education, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, "Characteristics of School Administrators" (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1959), pp. 2-7. (Multilithed.)

[7]Ibid., pp. 32-33.

[8]Robert B. Smawley, "Typal Sets and Syndromes of Administrative Behavior" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1961).

Osgood's Semantic Differential.[9] This was a transformation of the Guide into a polarized adjectival form, including twenty-five pairs of polarized terms. The two forms were hypothetically equivalent but were recommended to be applied together for maximum reliability.

Administration

The two forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide were utilized in the same ten elementary schools which had been selected to participate in the project using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The administration of these rating forms was done by the writer. Six teachers from each school staff were selected to rate the principal of the school, using both the 1961 Edition and the Adjectival Checklist. The selection of raters was made through the use of a sociometric device which implied characteristics and abilities deemed important in the rating task. A copy of the following paragraph was given to each member of the staff, excluding the principal:

> Sometimes there are professional concerns which you would like to discuss with another person. You would not necessarily choose this person on the basis of personal friendship, nor would you necessarily choose the most popular member of the school staff. Rather, you would choose a person whom you felt to be intelligent, professionally interested, and educationally informed. You would select a person whom you felt had the ability to evaluate a situation or a person in a fair-minded and objective manner.

The teachers were then asked to select the seven staff members (excluding the principal) whom they would choose, on the basis of the above criterion, and rank them one to seven in order of their preference.

---

[9]Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

The specific reason for this task was not stated at this time. Respondents were asked not to put their own names on the lists. Six teachers were chosen, by means of these rankings, to rate the principal of the school on both forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide. Both forms were used at the same sitting and with no specified time limit. The approximate time used by the respondents for completion of both forms was thirty-five minutes. Respondents were asked not to discuss the ratings, and at the same time they were told that the principal would not see the rating, nor were they to put their own names on the forms when completed. The data obtained by means of these procedures were utilized in the present study.

Method of Scoring

The rating forms were first scored by the traditional method which had been used in scoring all previous forms of the Guide. This scheme for scoring utilized a continuum including 2, 3, 4, and 5--with 5 representing the most favorable possible rating on each item. The total score was computed and later used in a portion of the statistical analyses.

Some statistical procedures used in the analysis assumed the division of ratings on each item into successful and unsuccessful responses. No such division was assumed in the traditional method of scoring the Guide. An alternate scheme for scoring was used. Whitlock had presented data which showed a power function to be the expression which best described the relation between performance observation and evaluation. The method of scoring supporting the theory utilizes only performance specimens indicating uncommonly effective or uncommonly ineffective performance. The assumption in the present study is that extreme values are

analogous to specimens sufficiently so as to justify the comparison of the reliability and validity of two instruments using the two methods of scoring.[10] Utilizing a method analogous to specimen scoring, all items in the Guide given a score of 5 by the traditional scoring method received a score of 1; all given a score of 2, 3, or 4 received a score of 0. Successful responses were then represented by a score of 1, unsuccessful responses by a score of 0.

Estimate of Instrument Reliability

The hypothesized equivalence of the two forms of the Guide was tested. Coefficients of correlation between the mean scores on the alternate forms--descriptive form and adjectival checklist--were computed using Pearson's product-moment method.[11]

Reliability coefficients were computed separately for the teachers' ratings, the supervisors' ratings, and the combined (teachers' and supervisors') ratings.

An additional reliability check for both forms of the TRG was computed by the internal consistency methods of the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 technique.[12]

---

[10]Gerald H. Whitlock, "The Application of Psychophysical Law to Performance Evaluation" (paper read before the Southern Society of Philosophy and Psychology, Atlanta, Georgia, March, 1961).

[11]J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (second edition; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 157.

[12]Harold Gulliksen, Theory of Mental Tests (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1950), pp. 225-26.

Another estimate of the reliability of the TRG ratings was obtained by computing the inter-correlation of the supervisors' independent ratings. The coefficients of correlation were converted to Fisher's z scores and a mean correlation determined.[13] Two separate inter-correlations were computed for each form of the TRG--one utilizing traditional scoring and one utilizing specimen scoring.

Estimate of Item Validity

Item validities were estimated by basing the analysis, as suggested by Kelley,[14] on only the upper and lower 27 per cent of the group. The estimate of the coefficient of correlation between item and test was obtained from tables prepared by Flanagan.[15] These correlation coefficients were then tested for significance by the use of Guilford's table[16] which indicates coefficients of correlation and t ratios significant at the 5 per cent level for varying degrees of freedom. Based on these validity indices, the following suggested item weights were derived for

---

[13]Allen L. Edwards, Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1954), pp. 305-06.

[14]T. L. Kelley, "The Selection of Upper and Lower Groups for the Validation of Test Items," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXX (January, 1939), 17-24.

[15]Robert L. Thorndike, Personal Selection (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1949), pp. 348-51.

[16]Guilford, op. cit., p. 609.

possible use in future research with the Guide:[17]

TRG Item	Weight	TRG Item	Weight
1	5	12	7
2	7	13	7
3	7	14	7
4	7	15	8
5	7	16	6
6	8	17	7
7	7	18	7
8	6	19	7
9	6	20	7
10	7	21	8
11	7		

Estimate of Instrument Validity

An estimate of instrument validity for the purpose of the present study only was obtained by computing Spearman's rank correlation between the initial ranking of schools by supervisors and the ranking using mean scores for each school on the Tennessee Rating Guide, 1961 Edition, and the Tennessee Rating Guide: Adjectival Checklist.[18]

IV. SUMMARY

Chapter III has included a description of the instruments investigated. It has also included detailed statistical procedures utilized in the analysis of the data included in the present study. For the sake of clarity, all procedures pertaining to the analysis of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire were described in one chapter section,

---

[17]J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (first edition; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1942), p. 301.

[18]Ferguson, op. cit.

and those pertaining to the analysis of the Tennessee Rating Guide were described in another section.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

The nature of the sub-problems associated with the present study indicated a number of statistical procedures which dealt in a particular analysis with only one of the instruments being investigated. For this reason, the results of the study pertaining only to the analysis of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III, are presented in the first section of this chapter, followed by a section which presents those results pertaining only to the Tennessee Rating Guide (1961 Edition and Adjectival Checklist). The final presentation of results in this chapter involves the relationship between the above two instruments.

II. ANALYSIS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE, FORM III

Method of Scoring

Results of the data utilized in devising a scoring scheme for the OCDQ to be employed in the present study are shown in Table I. This table indicates the frequency of response for each item in each of the five positions on the continuum relating to positive or negative organizational climate; also, the mean and standard deviation of each item are tabulated. Examination of this table reveals fourteen items whose mean value fell between 2.5 and 3.5. These items were excluded as being

TABLE I

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA UTILIZED IN DEVISING A SCORING SCHEME FOR THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE, FORM III

OCDQ Item Number	Frequencies ++ (5)	+ (4)	0 (3)	- (2)	-- (1)	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
* 1	9	43	34	9	5	3.42	.955
* 2	3	30	6	38	23	2.52	1.226
- 3	4	9	11	29	47	1.94	1.144
4	75	17	5	2	1	4.63	.760
* 5	10	22	37	25	6	3.05	1.057
- 6	6	7	4	37	46	1.90	1.150
- 7	1	5	6	27	61	1.58	.889
8	77	21	0	1	1	4.72	.620
* 9	6	23	25	24	22	2.67	1.223
10	45	28	9	11	7	3.93	1.273
-11	4	2	6	34	54	1.68	.973
12	63	27	6	3	1	4.48	.822
13	24	46	25	2	3	3.86	.910
-14	0	4	7	32	57	1.56	.784
-15	3	1	9	34	53	1.67	.910
*16	9	29	33	19	10	3.08	1.116
*17	13	34	11	25	17	3.01	1.344
-18	1	10	21	49	19	2.25	.914
-19	4	4	14	42	36	1.98	1.014
20	21	47	16	14	2	3.71	1.018
21	33	47	12	6	2	4.03	.937
22	32	41	14	10	3	3.89	1.062
-23	1	2	6	12	79	1.34	.768
24	27	52	10	8	3	3.92	.981
25	27	49	10	10	4	3.85	1.057
*26	7	39	14	25	15	2.98	1.238
-27	2	9	12	32	45	1.91	1.055
28	35	36	15	9	5	3.87	1.142
*29	3	19	25	37	16	2.56	1.066
*30	1	6	5	41	47	1.73	.886

*Excluded items

TABLE I (continued)

OCDQ Item Number	Frequencies ++ (5)	+ (4)	0 (3)	- (2)	-- (1)	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
-31	1	8	14	35	42	1.91	.985
32	54	39	5	1	1	4.44	.729
-33	1	0	10	39	50	1.63	.747
-34	3	13	11	52	21	2.25	1.028
-35	2	11	13	27	47	1.94	1.108
36	42	33	13	11	1	4.04	1.043
-37	1	1	8	35	55	1.58	.767
38	35	38	6	13	8	3.79	1.273
-39	5	3	14	30	48	1.87	1.088
-40	1	4	9	42	44	1.76	.854
41	65	29	5	1	0	4.58	.638
42	58	33	7	1	1	4.46	.757
43	87	11	1	0	1	4.83	.532
44	25	45	13	12	5	3.73	1.117
45	68	25	4	3	0	4.58	.713
46	69	28	0	3	0	4.63	.646
47	79	19	2	0	0	4.77	.468
48	24	44	13	16	3	3.61	1.229
49	58	38	1	2	1	4.50	.717
50	31	54	7	5	3	4.05	.925
51	75	20	4	1	0	4.46	.938
52	56	32	6	4	2	4.36	.915
53	58	32	4	5	1	4.41	.865
*54	17	33	21	18	11	3.27	1.254
55	53	32	4	4	7	4.20	1.154
56	51	31	10	4	4	4.21	1.047
57	64	32	3	0	1	4.58	.654
58	54	31	12	2	1	4.35	.845
*59	13	35	30	14	8	3.31	1.116
60	60	36	1	3	0	4.53	.673
-61	6	8	8	37	41	2.01	1.167
62	55	41	2	1	1	4.48	.688
63	26	41	19	9	5	3.74	1.097

*Excluded items

TABLE I (continued)

OCDQ Item Number	Frequencies ++ (5)	+ (4)	0 (3)	- (2)	-- (1)	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation
*64	4	37	26	23	10	3.02	1.082
65	48	41	5	4	2	4.29	.891
66	47	39	12	1	1	4.30	.797
67	50	41	6	2	1	4.37	.774
*68	18	31	25	21	5	3.36	1.150
-69	2	8	22	45	23	2.21	.956
70	28	40	17	8	7	3.74	1.160
-71	4	7	14	45	30	2.10	1.039
72	45	35	15	2	3	4.17	.964
-73	1	12	17	44	26	2.18	.988
*74	12	34	21	21	12	3.13	1.228
75	29	35	17	12	7	3.67	1.214
76	43	41	6	4	6	4.11	1.090
-77	5	7	9	39	40	1.98	1.109
*78	20	25	17	23	15	3.12	1.372
-79	2	2	19	24	53	1.76	.965
-80	5	12	28	19	36	2.31	1.220

*Excluded items

non-indicative for this phase of the present study. Forty-one items fell above a mean value of 3.51 and were considered positive items; twenty-five items fell below a mean value of 2.49 and were considered negative items. This revised list of sixty-six items, which was used for the major portion of the statistical analysis involving this instrument, is found in the Appendix and is identified as a modification of Form III.

Estimate of Instrument Reliability

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III, was administered to 203 teachers and principals. The fact that in each of the ten selected schools the teachers rated only the principal of that school complicated the computation of an estimate of reliability. As noted on page 39 of Chapter III, a special intra-class correlation procedure was used. This procedure yielded first a reliability coefficient of .160 for the average reliability of the single rating. When raised by the special application of the Spearman-Brown formula, the reliability coefficient for the average ratings proved to be .79. The factor k, by which the value for this single rating was raised, was 20.1 which is close to the harmonic mean of the number of teachers per principal.

Estimates of the reliability of the eight subtests of the OCDQ, Form IV, were reported in Table VI of the Utah Project.[1] Since standard

[1] Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools" (unpublished research report performed at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pursuant to Contract No. SAE 543[8639] with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962).

scores on these tests were utilized in a portion of the statistical analysis, this table is reproduced as Table II in the present study.

Estimate of Instrument Validity

An estimate of instrument validity was obtained by computing Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation between the initial ranking of schools by supervisors and the ranking utilizing the mean scores obtained for each school on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III. This coefficient of rank correlation proved to be .295, which is not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

In Table III is shown an additional estimate of validity by means of rank correlations computed between the initial rankings of schools by supervisors and the rankings by standard scores obtained for each school on each of the eight subtests of the OCDQ, Form IV. Table IV includes the standard scores and the rankings from which these correlations were computed. It is seen that only for Subtest VI, Production Emphasis, is the correlation significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Estimate of Item Validity

As reported in Chapter III, page 39, procedures for the item analysis of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III, was a modification by Kirkpatrick and Cureton of the conventional high and low criterion group methods. In this instance, the top fifty ratings and the bottom fifty ratings were utilized in the analysis. In Table V are shown the number of correct responses to each item by the top fifty respondents and also those of the bottom fifty respondents. The difference

TABLE II

ESTIMATES OF INTERNAL CONSISTENCY AND OF EQUIVALENCE FOR THE EIGHT OCDQ SUBTESTS*

	Split-half Coefficient of Reliability, Corrected by the Spearman-Brown Formula[a] (N = 1151)	Correlation Between Scores of the Odd-numbered and the Even-numbered Respondents in Each School[b] (N = 71)	Communality Estimates[c] for Three-Factor Rotational Solution (N = 1151)
1. Disengagement	.73	.59	.66
2. Hindrance	.68	.54	.44
3. Esprit	.75	.61	.73
4. Intimacy	.60	.49	.53
5. Aloofness	.26	.76	.72
6. Production Emphasis	.55	.73	.53
7. Thrust	.84	.75	.68
8. Consideration	.59	.63	.64

[a]Estimate of internal consistency
[b]Estimate of equivalence
[c]These are lower-bound, conservative estimates of equivalence.

*Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools" (unpublished research report performed at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pursuant to Contract No. SAE 543[8639] with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962).

TABLE III

CORRELATION OF THE INITIAL RANKING OF SCHOOLS BY SUPERVISORS AND THE SCHOOL RANKINGS ON EACH OF THE EIGHT SUBTESTS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM III)

Subtests	Spearman Rank	Subtests	Spearman Rank
I	.125	V	-.151
II	.510	VI	-.700*
III	.122	VII	-.150
IV	.440	VIII	-.343

*p = < .05

TABLE IV

RANKINGS OF THE TEN SELECTED SCHOOLS BASED ON THE STANDARD SCORES* OBTAINED FROM THE EIGHT SUBTESTS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

	Subtests															
	I		II		III		IV		V		VI		VII		VIII	
School	Standard Score	Rank	Standard Score	Rank	Standard Score	Rank	Standard Score	Rank	Standard Score	Rank	Standard Score	Rank	Standard Score	Rank	Standard Score	Rank
A	63	1.5	61	1.0	43	7.0	62	1.5	47	4.0	42	8.5	40	10.0	43	7.0
B	63	1.5	53	4.5	38	9.0	45	10.0	38	8.0	45	7.0	56	6.0	62	1.0
C	59	4.0	48	3.0	34	10.0	59	3.5	58	3.0	47	6.0	46	9.0	40	9.0
D	33	9.5	46	7.0	56	4.0	49	7.0	62	1.5	62	1.0	50	7.0	42	8.0
E	39	8.0	45	8.5	65	1.0	56	5.0	40	5.0	42	8.5	61	1.0	52	3.0
F	61	3.0	43	10.0	43	5.0	48	8.5	33	9.0	61	3.0	60	2.5	47	4.5
G	45	7.0	45	8.5	58	3.0	53	6.0	31	10.0	61	3.0	60	2.5	47	4.5
H	56	5.0	60	2.0	44	6.0	62	1.5	39	6.5	37	10.0	58	5.0	44	6.0
I	33	9.5	53	4.5	62	2.0	59	3.5	39	6.5	48	5.0	48	8.0	58	2.0
J	48	6.0	48	6.0	41	8.0	48	8.5	62	1.5	61	3.0	59	4.0	34	10.0

*Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools" (unpublished research report performed at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pursuant to Contract No. SAE 543[8639] with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962).

in the number of correct responses between the top and bottom groups, also the sums of the correct responses of both groups, are indicated. These differences and sums, when entered in the appropriate table,[2] yielded levels of significance for the various items. These levels are indicated in Table V. It is observed that Items 31, 61, and 64 (negative) and Items 33-37, 39, 44-56, and 60 (positive) were statistically significant at the .002 level of confidence. Item 51 (positive) was significant at the .02 level. A total of twenty-four items was statistically significant.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE (1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST)

Estimate of Instrument Reliability

An initial estimate of reliability was obtained by testing the hypothesized equivalence of the two forms. Tables VI and VII include the mean scores obtained from both teachers' and supervisors' ratings on both forms of the Guide. These scores were obtained through the traditional scoring method. Three separate computations by Pearson's Product-moment method of correlation yielded the following reliability coefficients:

Supervisors' ratings	+.8452
Teachers' ratings	+.9286
Combined (teachers' and supervisors') ratings	+.8989

---

[2] James J. Kirkpatrick and Edward E. Cureton, "Simplified Tables for Item Analyses," Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIV (Winter, 1954), 710.

TABLE V

RESULTS OF ITEM ANALYSIS OF TWO HUNDRED THREE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRES, FORM III ADMINISTERED TO TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS IN TEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Item*	Number of Correct Responses in Top Fifty	Number of Correct Responses in Bottom Fifty	Difference in No. of Correct Responses Between High and Low Groups	Sum of No. of Correct Responses in High and Low Groups	Level of Significance**
- 1	11	21	10	32	
2	21	13	- 8	34	
- 3	10	17	7	27	
- 4	29	28	- 1	57	
5	26	17	- 9	43	
6	1	2	1	3	
- 7	7	7	0	14	
8	15	10	- 5	25	
9	40	26	-14	66	
-10	9	14	5	23	
-11	20	34	14	54	
-12	13	27	14	40	
-13	9	5	- 4	14	
14	24	11	-13	35	
15	13	12	- 1	25	
16	20	10	-10	30	
-17	18	25	7	43	
18	8	9	1	17	
19	4	5	1	9	
-20	2	8	6	10	.10
21	14	21	7	35	
-22	3	5	2	8	
-23	40	32	- 8	72	
24	44	37	- 7	81	
-25	44	31	-13	75	
-26	26	16	-10	42	
-27	18	15	- 3	33	
28	28	13	-15	41	
-29	33	24	- 9	57	
30	27	12	-15	39	
-31	40	24	-16	64	.002
-32	1	6	5	7	
33	36	19	-17	55	.002
34	39	19	-20	58	.002

TABLE V (continued)

Item*	Number of Correct Responses in Top Fifty	Number of Correct Responses in Bottom Fifty	Difference in No. of Correct Responses Between High and Low Groups	Sum of No. of Correct Responses in High and Low Groups	Level of Significance**
35	48	25	-23	73	.002
36	37	18	-19	55	.002
37	44	24	-20	68	.002
38	20	7	-13	27	
39	43	24	-19	67	.002
40	14	11	- 3	25	
41	12	8	- 4	20	
42	16	11	- 5	27	
43	45	31	-14	76	
44	48	23	-25	71	.002
45	40	7	-33	47	.002
46	44	14	-30	58	.002
47	49	28	-21	77	.002
48	43	15	-28	58	.002
49	49	24	-25	73	.002
50	42	14	-28	56	.002
51	48	36	-12	84	.02
52	43	26	-17	69	.002
53	46	29	-17	75	.002
54	38	14	-24	52	.002
55	48	31	-17	79	.002
56	40	21	-19	61	.002
-57	29	26	- 3	55	
58	9	7	- 2	16	
-59	26	17	- 9	43	
60	39	18	-21	57	.002
-61	44	19	-25	63	.002
62	43	28	-15	71	
63	25	13	-12	38	
-64	32	15	-17	47	.002
-65	25	16	- 9	41	
-66	3	2	- 1	5	

*Items preceded by a minus (-) are negative items.

**Only those items significant at the .10 level or greater are reported.

TABLE VI

MEAN RAW SCORES OF RATINGS BY TEACHERS ON TEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OBTAINED FROM TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE: 1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST*

School and Principal	Rating Guide--1961	Adjectival Checklist	School and Principal	Rating Guide--1961	Adjectival Checklist
A	4.62	4.68	F	4.09	4.20
A	4.56	4.56	F	3.67	4.48
A	4.76	4.60	F	2.14	2.60
A	3.09	3.96	F	2.47	2.88
A	3.86	4.16	F	2.52	3.28
A	4.76	4.44	F	2.19	2.32
B	4.38	4.36	G	4.43	4.52
B	4.67	5.00	G	4.72	4.72
B	4.86	4.96	G	4.19	4.24
B	5.00	4.96	G	3.95	4.36
B	4.76	5.00	G	4.33	4.32
B	4.62	4.60	G	4.72	4.44
C	3.00	3.68	H	3.67	4.28
C	4.05	4.40	H	4.91	4.76
C	4.24	4.64	H	4.29	4.60
C	4.28	4.52	H	4.29	4.60
C	3.62	4.24	H	4.57	4.90
C	3.38	3.80	H	4.33	4.92
D	4.62	4.76	I	3.14	3.48
D	4.60	4.68	I	3.57	3.96
D	3.38	3.92	I	4.14	4.08
D	4.24	4.44	I	3.95	4.20
D	3.56	3.96	I	4.09	4.20
D	4.09	4.08	I	3.57	3.60
E	4.33	4.24	J	3.28	4.00
E	4.24	4.32	J	4.56	4.76
E	4.43	4.44	J	2.66	3.32
E	4.38	4.48	J	3.38	4.12
E	4.33	4.56	J	3.85	3.44
E	4.52	4.72	J	4.24	4.44

*Scores computed by traditional scoring method

TABLE VII

MEAN RAW SCORES OF RATING BY SUPERVISORS ON TEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OBTAINED FROM TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE: 1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST*

School and Principal	Supervisor	Rating Guide 1961	Adjectival Checklist	School and Principal	Supervisor	Rating Guide 1961	Adjectival Checklist
A	1	4.24	4.28	A	3	4.09	4.36
B	1	4.38	4.60	B	3	4.05	4.20
C	1	2.43	2.72	C	3	3.24	3.32
D	1	3.24	3.76	D	3	3.43	3.32
E	1	3.09	3.88	E	3	3.91	3.88
F	1	3.05	2.88	F	3	3.33	3.48
G	1	4.00	4.08	G	3	4.43	4.32
H	1	3.95	4.20	H	3	4.29	4.20
I	1	3.48	3.40	I	3	4.29	3.68
J	1	3.24	2.92	J	3	3.33	3.32
A	2	4.00	4.36	A	4	4.62	4.48
B	2	4.00	4.36	B	4	4.67	4.68
C	2	2.00	2.12	C	4	3.38	3.84
D	2	3.00	3.96	D	4	3.24	3.64
E	2	4.19	4.32	E	4	3.95	4.00
F	2	3.71	3.88	F	4	3.00	3.20
G	2	3.52	3.76	G	4	4.66	4.60
H	2	4.04	4.90	H	4	4.48	4.56
I	2	3.72	3.80	I	4	3.05	3.64
J	2	2.52	3.44	J	4	4.09	4.12

*Scores computed by traditional scoring method

Tables VIII and IX include the raw scores from both teachers' and supervisors' ratings on both forms of the Guide as obtained by means of specimen scoring. These scores were utilized in an additional reliability check, utilizing the Kuder-Richardson (Formula 21 technique), for internal consistency of both forms of the TRG.[3] This computation yielded the following reliability coefficients:

TRG Checklist (teachers' ratings)	+.929
TRG Checklist (supervisors' ratings)	+.898
TRG 1961 Edition (teachers' ratings)	+.868
TRG 1961 Edition (supervisors' ratings)	+.876

Another estimate of reliability was computed from the mean scores of the supervisors' ratings on both forms of the Guide included in Tables VI and VII, pages 60 and 61. An inter-correlation of the supervisors' independent ratings make up Table X, in which are shown the six possible inter-correlations for each form of the TRG and also the composite reliability coefficient for each of the forms as they were computed using both traditional and specimen scores.

Estimate of Instrument Validity

An estimate of instrument validity, for the purpose of the present study only, was obtained by computing the Spearman rank correlation between the ranking by mean scores obtained for each school on each form of the Tennessee Rating Guide and the initial ranking of schools by

---

[3]Harold Gulliksen, Theory of Mental Tests (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1950), pp. 225-26.

TABLE VIII

RAW SCORES OF RATING BY TEACHERS ON TEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OBTAINED FROM TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE: 1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST*

School and Principal	Adjectival Checklist	Rating Guide--1961	School and Principal	Adjectival Checklist	Rating Guide--1961
A	4	5	F	2	0
A	16	16	F	0	0
A	14	16	F	8	1
A	22	17	F	0	0
A	15	16	F	16	10
A	9	8	F	13	11
B	15	15	G	14	10
B	25	12	G	18	15
B	25	18	G	19	15
B	24	18	G	9	6
B	24	21	G	13	5
B	13	11	G	8	8
C	4	2	H	22	16
C	7	4	H	23	19
C	12	6	H	8	4
C	13	6	H	23	10
C	8	2	H	15	10
C	15	5	H	15	10
D	3	1	I	4	4
D	20	15	I	6	7
D	17	15	I	6	4
D	4	6	I	13	6
D	11	6	I	0	1
D	7	1	I	2	1
E	18	11	J	5	3
E	13	12	J	19	12
E	11	9	J	3	1
E	12	10	J	8	0
E	16	10	J	12	6
E	15	8	J	0	6

*Scores computed by specimen scoring method

TABLE IX

RAW SCORES OF RATING BY SUPERVISORS ON TEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OBTAINED FROM TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE: 1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST*

School and Principal	Super-visor	Rating Guide 1961	Adjectival Checklist	School and Principal	Super-visor	Rating Guide 1961	Adjectival Checklist
A	1	9	12	A	3	7	11
B	1	9	15	B	3	3	9
C	1	0	1	C	3	1	2
D	1	3	6	D	3	1	2
E	1	1	4	E	3	5	6
F	1	0	0	F	3	1	2
G	1	6	7	G	3	10	11
H	1	5	9	H	3	10	9
I	1	1	1	I	3	2	5
J	1	1	0	J	3	3	3
A	2	5	10	A	4	13	13
B	2	1	9	B	4	14	17
C	2	0	0	C	4	2	4
D	2	0	0	D	4	2	4
E	2	7	10	E	4	4	6
F	2	0	1	F	4	0	1
G	2	0	0	G	4	14	18
H	2	17	22	H	4	10	14
I	2	0	0	I	4	0	2
J	2	1	0	J	4	4	7

*Scores computed by specimen scoring method

TABLE X

RESULTS OF INTER-CORRELATIONS OF FOUR SUPERVISORS' INDEPENDENT RATINGS ON THE TRG ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST AND TRG 1961 EDITION; ALSO A RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT FOR EACH FORM

TRG Forms	Supervisors						Reliability Coefficient
	KL	KM	KN	LM	LN	MN	
Adjectival Checklist							
Traditional scoring	.783	.881	.724	.648	.380	.811	.736
Specimen scoring	.587	.777	.812	.556	.485	.887	.717
1961 Edition							
Traditional scoring	.625	.761	.772	.703	.368	.564	.650
Specimen scoring	.221	.552	.922	.644	.300	.741	.633

supervisors. These computations yielded the following coefficients of correlation:

Tennessee Rating Guide	Traditional Scoring	Specimen Scoring
1961 Edition and Supervisors' Rankings	.843	.916
Adjectival Checklist and Supervisors' Rankings	.928	.807

Estimate of Item Validity

Results of the item analysis of the data obtained from the administration of one hundred Tennessee Rating Guides, 1961 Edition, to teachers and supervisors are shown in Table XI.

Examination of the estimates of validity coefficients obtained from Flanagan's table showed that all validity coefficients were positive and ranged from .32 to .90 with 48 per cent of the items having validity coefficients ranging from .78 to .90 and 52 per cent ranging from .35 to .70.

Observation frequency rates (ratio of number of times an item was observed in either the upper 27 per cent group or the lower 27 per cent group to its opportunity to be observed in that group) were examined. It was found that 33 per cent of the items had an observation frequency of less than .63, while 67 per cent of the items had observation frequency rates ranging from .63 to .93.

IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE (1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST) AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM III)

Table XII includes the mean scores for each school obtained by both

TABLE XI

RESULTS OF ITEM ANALYSIS OF ONE HUNDRED TENNESSEE RATING GUIDES, 1961 EDITION ADMINISTERED TO TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS IN TEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Item	Number of Times Observed in Lower 27 Per Cent	Number of Times Observed in Upper 27 Per Cent	Total Number of Times Observed	Observation Frequency in Lower 27 Per Cent	Observation Frequency in Upper 27 Per Cent	Estimate of Item Validity Coefficient ϕ
1	9	18	27	0.33	0.67	0.35
2	0	21	21	*0.00	0.78	0.83
3	0	17	17	0.00	0.63	0.78
4	0	17	17	0.00	0.63	0.78
5	3	22	25	0.11	0.81	0.69
6	0	23	23	0.00	0.85	0.87
7	1	12	13	0.04	0.44	0.57
8	0	10	10	0.00	0.37	0.67
9	3	17	20	0.11	0.63	0.56
10	1	15	16	0.04	0.56	0.64
11	1	15	16	0.04	0.56	0.64
12	1	12	13	0.04	0.44	0.57
13	0	18	18	0.00	0.67	0.80
14	2	20	22	0.07	0.74	0.70
15	1	24	25	0.04	0.89	0.83
16	5	16	21	0.19	0.59	0.43
17	1	22	23	0.04	0.81	0.78
18	0	18	18	0.00	0.67	0.80
19	1	23	24	0.04	0.85	0.81
20	7	15	22	0.26	0.56	0.32
21	0	25	25	0.00	0.93	0.90

*Zeros are treated as ones in using Guilford's table.

TABLE XII

MEAN SCORES OF RATINGS BY TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND SUPERVISORS ON TEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OBTAINED FROM TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE (1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST) AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM III)

	TRG 1961 Edition		TRG Checklist		
School	Traditional Scoring	Specimen Scoring	Traditional Scoring	Specimen Scoring	OCDQ
A	4.260	11.2	4.388	12.6	9.818
B	4.539	12.2	4.672	17.6	12.391
C	3.362	2.8	3.728	6.6	9.705
D	3.740	5.0	4.052	7.4	12.400
E	4.137	7.7	4.284	11.1	10.666
F	3.017	2.3	3.320	4.3	6.636
G	4.295	8.9	4.336	11.7	10.565
H	4.282	11.1	4.592	16.0	9.772
I	3.700	2.6	3.804	3.9	7.454
J	3.515	3.7	3.788	5.7	8.363

traditional and specimen scoring from the two forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide. Mean scores obtained from Form III of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire are also included. Pearson's product-moment correlations were computed between the mean scores obtained from each form of the TRG (utilizing traditional and specimen scoring) and the mean scores of the OCDQ, Form III. These computations yielded the following correlation coefficients:

OCDQ and TRG: Adjectival Checklist

Traditional scoring	+.7329
Specimen scoring	+.6525

OCDQ and TRG, 1961 Edition

Traditional scoring	+.6677
Specimen scoring	+.6047

An additional estimate of relationship between the Tennessee Rating Guide and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire is shown in Table XIII. Spearman rank correlation coefficients between the ranking of schools on the eight subtests of the OCDQ, Form IV, and the ranking of schools on each of the TRG forms are indicated. None of the correlations were significant at the .05 level.

V. RESULTS OF EXPERIMENTAL SCORING

In four statistical computations involving the two forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide, there was some experimentation with two types of scoring. Both the traditional scoring and specimen scoring[4] were used

---

[4]Gerald H. Whitlock, "The Application of Psychophysical Law to Performance Evaluation" (paper read before the Southern Society of Philosophy and Psychology, Atlanta, Georgia, March, 1961).

TABLE XIII

CORRELATION OF THE RANKING OF SCHOOLS ON EACH OF THE EIGHT SUBTESTS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE WITH THE RANKING OF SCHOOLS ON THE RATINGS ON THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE (1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST)

Subtests	TRG 1961 Edition	TRG Adjectival Checklist
I	.146	.237
II	.249	.419
III	.110	-.02
IV	-.03	.191
V	-.34	-.24
VI	-.40	-.54
VII	.058	-.06
VIII	.560	.391

for the purpose of comparing the reliability of the two scoring methods.

Product-moment correlations were computed between the two methods of scoring on each form of the Guide. Using mean scores of the ten schools, this computation yielded coefficients of .929 for the TRG, 1961 Edition, and .940 for the TRG: Adjectival Checklist.

Using these same mean scores, correlations between the two forms of the Guide were computed for both traditional and specimen scoring. These computations yielded reliability coefficients of +.9787 for traditional scoring and +.9688 for specimen scoring.

An estimate of instrument validity, for the purpose of the present study only, was obtained by computing the Spearman rank correlation between the initial ranking of schools by supervisors and the mean scores for each school on each form of the Guide. The computation, utilizing traditional scoring, yielded a correlation coefficient of .843 for the TRG, 1961 Edition, and .928 for the TRG: Adjectival Checklist. A similar computation utilizing specimen scoring yielded a correlation coefficient of .916 for the TRG, 1961 Edition, and .807 for the TRG Adjectival Checklist.

The reliability coefficients computed from the inter-correlation of the supervisors' independent ratings provided an additional comparison of the two methods of scoring. These coefficients computed from the utilization of both specimen and traditional scoring are shown in Table X, page 65. The overall reliability coefficient for the TRG: Adjectival Checklist was .736 by traditional scoring and .717 by specimen scoring. The comparable coefficient for the TRG, 1961 Edition, was .650 by traditional scoring and .633 by specimen scoring.

VI. SUMMARY

Chapter IV has included a presentation of results obtained by the statistical procedures utilized in the present study. Appropriate references to the methodology described in Chapter III have been made.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION

Before proceeding with any discussion of the results of the present study, it is important that the study itself be viewed in its proper perspective. Any generalizations or inferences beyond its limitations would indeed be presumptuous. Numerous studies utilizing various forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide have been made, but the present study pertained only to the 1961 Revision and the Adjectival Checklist developed by Smawley.[1] The one major factor considered throughout this study has been "staff morale" as a function of the organizational climate of a school. The Tennessee Rating Guide was never purported to assess "staff morale," per se. However, as it has been used to evaluate effective and ineffective administrative behavior, it is reasonable to assume that such evaluations have not been devoid of "morale influencing factors." The organizational climate of a school, one function of which is assumed to be "teacher morale," cannot be separated from the behavior of its administrator.

The present study, in only a very small degree, estimated the relationship of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire,

---

[1]Robert B. Smawley, "Typal Sets and Syndromes of Administrative Behavior" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1961).

Form IV, as developed in the first phase of the Utah Project,[2] to the Tennessee Rating Guide. The major portion of the present study, including only ten of the seventy-one schools used in the Utah Project involved an experimental utilization of the "climate items" comprising Form III of the OCDQ. The course was uncharted and completely unrelated to the direction taken by the researchers at the University of Utah. It is within this context that any discussion of results must be placed.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE, FORM III

Method of Scoring

As the method devised for scoring the OCDQ, Form III, in the present study is discussed, it is important again to remember the basic difference in approach from that of the Utah Research Project. In the present study the eighty items of Form III were treated as a total group and not grouped into dimension scores. In the Utah Project total scores on the instrument were not considered relevant. Each of the eighty items was not assumed to make either a positive or negative contribution to staff morale or organizational climate. Esprit, or "morale," designated only one of the eight subtests to which the sixty-four items of the OCDQ, Form IV, were assigned in the Utah Project. In this study Halpin and Croft were able to discriminate six organizational climates and found

---

[2]Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools" (unpublished research report performed at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pursuant to Contract No. SAE 543[8639] with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962).

that these could be ranked with respect to the school's score on Esprit, the definition of which is as follows:

> Esprit refers to "morale." The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.[3]

Although major consideration was given to "morale" in both studies, the Utah Project treated it as one of many dimensions. In the present study, staff "morale" is the only function of organizational climate which was considered. This experimental approach to the utilization of the data obtained from the administration of Form III of the OCDQ furnished the basis for devising a different scoring scheme.

The fourteen items excluded by the "expert" ratings as being non-indicative for the present study seemed difficult to group into particular categories. Some items were ambiguous. Other items pertained to personal, rather than professional, relationships among the staff and were judged unimportant in terms of staff morale or organizational climate. Some items pertaining to professional relationships which were excluded were as follows: The principal "runs the faculty meeting like a business conference," "schedules work for the teachers," "contacts the teacher each day," "takes the blame when parents criticize the teachers," and "corrects teachers' mistakes." These items were judged to have little influence upon staff morale or organizational climate.

The twenty-five climate items considered negative seemed to imply, in the main, the following: (1) too many routine duties for teachers,

---

[3] Ibid., p. 40.

(2) principal dominance, (3) little participation by teachers in school operation, and (4) teachers operating in small cliques. The forty-one positive items indicated, for the most part, a climate of cooperation and respect between the teachers and the principal.

Instrument Reliability and Validity

The computation utilizing a special intra-class correlation,[4] appropriate for an experimental situation wherein the judges are rating different persons, yielded first a reliability coefficient of +.16 for a single rating. Then the special application of the Spearman-Brown formula raised this coefficient to +.79, an estimate of the reliability of average ratings. This is a moderately high reliability coefficient (+.79) indicating that at the .01 level of significance this questionnaire could be expected to measure consistently from one time to another. Repeated administration could be expected to yield comparable scores.

Two estimates of instrument validity were computed. One involved the computation of the Spearman rank correlation between the initial ranking of the schools by supervisors and the ranking obtained from the standard scores for each school on each of the eight subtests of the OCDQ, Form IV.

The standard scores on the eight subtests had been standardized for each school twice.[5] Both standardization procedures were based upon a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. A standard score on a

---

[4]Robert L. Ebel, "Estimation of the Reliability of Ratings," Psychometrika, XVI (January-December, 1951), 407-24.

[5]Halpin and Croft, op. cit., pp. 92-94.

subtest was based upon the relative emphasis of that subtest in terms of the seven other subtests. A standard score above 50 on a subtest indicated two things--first, that the given school scored above the mean of the school's other subtest scores; second, that the score was above the mean of the sample in relation to the emphasis given that subtest within a school.

These standard scores for the ten schools included in the present study are reported in Table IV, page 56, and were utilized in an attempt to determine the relationship between the eight subtests and the initial ranking of schools by supervisors. This initial ranking had been done in terms of one criterion--"staff morale." Esprit had assumed an important role in the Utah Project but had been only one of many dimensions.

The ten schools were ranked in terms of the standard scores on each test. A Spearman rank correlation between the initial ranking by supervisors and the ranking on each subtest was computed and is reported in Table III, page 55. The coefficients yielded by this computation were tested for significance. Only Subtest VI, Production Emphasis, was negatively significant at the .02 level.

A second estimate of instrument validity was obtained by the computation of the Spearman rank correlation between the initial ranking of schools by supervisors and the school rankings utilizing the mean scores for each school on the OCDQ, Form III. The correlation coefficient (.295) was not statistically significant. This indicates that "staff morale," as assessed by the OCDQ, Form III, and "staff morale," as evaluated by the supervisors, was comprised of different elements.

Item Analysis

The estimate of item validities was computed, as suggested by Kirkpatrick and Cureton, using a modification of the conventional high and low group methods.[6] Form III (sixty-six item modification) of the OCDQ assumed positive and negative items in terms of influence upon organizational climate. An examination of the item validities in Table V, pages 58 and 59, reveals the following: Only one of the first thirty items, which include sixteen negative items, assumed any statistical significance. Item 20 (negative), which stated that the rules set by the principal were never questioned, was significant at the .1 level. Item 51 (positive), stating that administrative paper work was burdensome, was significant at the .02 level. Twenty-two items, including three negatives, were significant at the .002 level. These latter items could be roughly grouped into the following categories: direct teacher-principal professional relationships, thirteen items; indirect teacher-principal professional relationships, six items; teacher-pupil relationships, one item. The two additional items in this grouping were "morale" statements *per se*.

In summary, of the sixty-six items in the modified Form III, only twenty-four items assumed an acceptable level of significance.

---

[6]James J. Kirkpatrick and Edward E. Cureton, "Simplified Tables for Item Analysis," Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIV (Winter, 1954), 709-14.

III. TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE (1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST)

Instrument Reliability and Validity

Smawley had hypothesized the equivalence of the TRG, 1961 Edition, and the TRG: Adjectival Checklist but had suggested that they be applied together for maximum reliability.[7] One estimate of reliability computed in the present study has verified Smawley's hypothesis.

In testing this hypothesis by the use of alternate forms, significant reliability coefficients were revealed. The most significant coefficient (+.9286) was obtained from teachers' ratings, which are as close to peer ratings as is possible in the situations being examined. The least significant coefficient (+.8452) was obtained from the supervisors' ratings. Ratings by superiors are not accorded, by some authorities, the reliability assigned to peer ratings. The coefficient obtained from the combination ratings by both teachers and supervisors was also significantly high (+.8989), differing only .029 from the teachers' ratings and .053 from the supervisors' ratings. Each of the three reliability coefficients was significant at the .01 level.

When these two instruments were tested for internal consistency, utilizing Kuder-Richardson Formula 21,[8] they yielded comparable reliability coefficients. The TRG Checklist (teachers' ratings) and the TRG,

---

[7] Smawley, op. cit., p. 168.

[8] Harold Gulliksen, Theory of Mental Tests (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1949), pp. 348-51.

1961 Edition (teachers' ratings), yielded coefficients of +.929 and +.868, respectively, a difference of only .061. The TRG Checklist (supervisors' ratings) and the TRG, 1961 Edition (supervisors' ratings), yielded coefficients of +.898 and +.876, respectively, a difference of only .022. All of these coefficients were significant at the .01 level.

The estimate of the reliability of the independent ratings by supervisors further verified the reliability of the two forms of the Guide. All of the inter-correlations were significant at the .01 level for both forms. The overall reliability coefficient for the TRG Checklist was +.736, significant at the .01 level. The corresponding coefficient for the TRG, 1961 Edition, was +.650, significant at the .02 level.

Since the Tennessee Rating Guide had not been designed to measure "staff morale," per se, an estimate of instrument validity was computed for the purpose of the present study only. Correlations computed between school rankings in terms of the ratings on each form of the Guide and the initial rankings of schools by supervisors on the "morale" criterion were significant. The correlation between the school ranking by the mean scores on the TRG, 1961 Edition, and the initial ranking of schools by supervisors yielded a coefficient of +.843; the correlation between the TRG Checklist and the initial ranking of schools yielded a coefficient of +.928. Both of these coefficients were significant at the .01 level. This estimate would suggest that the Guide has unusually high validity when used as a morale measure.

The ratings of both teachers and supervisors on both forms of the Guide were utilized in this estimate. In view of this fact, it is

apparent that the characteristics of educational administrators included in the Tennessee Rating Guide are highly influential factors affecting staff morale as viewed by both of these groups. The Guide merits further investigation in terms of its possible contribution in the area of assessment of "staff morale."

Item Analysis

The estimate of item validities was computed, as suggested by Kelley,[9] utilizing the top 27 per cent of the group and the bottom 27 per cent of the group tested. Examination of the results of the analysis of the TRG, 1961 Edition, indicated that the most discriminative item-scale in the Guide asks the question, "Is an effective (or potentially effective) administrator?" In previous item analyses of various forms of the Guide, this item was considered the criterion item against which all other items were analyzed. In the present study the total score is assumed to be a better criterion for item analyses than the score on any single item. However, finding that the criterion item used in previous analyses is the most discriminative item in the analysis against the total score further validates its previous use as a criterion item.

Five items in addition to the criterion item had validity coefficients of .80 or above. These were as follows: "Is intelligent and perceptive in problem analysis?" "Is skillful in stimulating others to achieve and share responsibility?" "Is trustworthy in dealings with

---

[9] T. L. Kelley, "The Selection of Upper and Lower Groups for the Validation of Test Items," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXX (January, 1939), 17-24.

people?" "Is well informed of current affairs and trends?" "Is stable 'under fire,' inspires others' confidence?" Two items had validity coefficients of .35 or below; namely, "Is active in community and public life?" "Is friendly and sociable?" All items included in the Guide were significant at the .01 level of confidence.

IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE (1961 EDITION AND ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST) AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM III)

The coefficients computed by the Spearman rank correlation between the ranking of schools on the eight subtests of the OCDQ, Form IV, and the rankings obtained from the ratings on each form of the Guide are indicated in Table XIII, page 70. Only one correlation coefficient was significant at even as much as the .09 level. This coefficient (+.560) was yielded by the computation of the correlation between the ranking by the ratings on the TRG, 1961 Edition, and the rankings on Subtest VIII, Consideration. The relationship between the two instruments, when assessed by the above procedure, assumed only minor significance.

When product-moment correlations were computed between the mean scores obtained from each form of the TRG and the mean scores of the OCDQ, Form III, a different pattern of relationship was observed. Correlation coefficients of +.7329 and +.6677 for the TRG, 1961 Edition, and the Adjectival Checklist, respectively, were yielded when a correlation with the OCDQ, Form III, was computed. These coefficients were all moderately

high and significant at approximately the .01 level. This degree of significance would indicate that the two forms of the Guide and the OCDQ, Form III (modification), assess comparable circumstances and behaviors which comprise the organizational climate of a school.

V. RESULTS OF EXPERIMENTAL SCORING

The experimentation utilizing data obtained by both traditional and specimen scoring methods proved indeed interesting. In the computation of two estimates of the reliability of the Tennessee Rating Guide, the two scoring methods proved to be almost equally reliable at the .01 level of significance. In a comparative analysis between the mean scores obtained from the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III, and the two forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide, utilizing both scoring methods, the correlation coefficients were comparable and significant at approximately the .02 level. An estimate of instrument validity for the TRG was computed by Spearman's rank correlation (using both traditional and specimen scoring for the Guide) between the initial ranking of schools by supervisors and the ranking obtained from the mean scores on each form of the Guide. The coefficients were comparable and significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The two scoring methods yielded practically the same results in all computations where both were utilized. The reliability of both was almost identical and extremely high. The validity coefficients were only slightly higher with traditional scoring. These findings would support the theory of scoring which utilizes only performance specimens indicating

uncommonly effective or uncommonly ineffective performance.[10] The assumption that extreme values are analogous to specimens sufficiently so to justify the comparison of the reliability and validity of two instruments using the two methods of scoring proved valid for the present study.

VI. SUMMARY

The problem of the present study sought: (1) to determine the relation between the administrative behavior of an elementary school principal (as assessed by the instruments--the Tennessee Rating Guide, 1961 Edition, and the Tennessee Rating Guide: Adjectival Checklist) and the ranking of his school on overall morale, (2) to determine the relationship between the organizational climate of his school (as assessed by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III) and the rankings of his school on overall morale, and (3) to determine the relationship between the two instruments. There was no attempt made to determine these relationships beyond the limits of these two instruments. A relationship between the behavior of a school administrator and the climate of the school which he administered had long been assumed. However, tangible means of assessing this relationship have been limited.

Prior to the assessing of any relationship between these instruments, certain sub-problems were perceived as necessary tasks. The hypothesized equivalence of the two forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide

---

[10]Gerald H. Whitlock, "The Application of Psychophysical Law to Performance Evaluation" (paper read before the Southern Society of Philosophy and Psychology, Atlanta, Georgia, March, 1961).

proved valid. An estimate of item validities for the Tennessee Rating Guide, 1961 Edition, in terms of the continuous variable of the total score, proved all items significant. The most discriminative item scale in the Guide proved to be Item 21, the criterion item used in previous item analyses of forms of the Guide. This finding reinforced the validity of this item having been used as a criterion for previous item analyses.

The reliability of the OCDQ, Form III (sixty-six item modification), proved to be such as would be acceptable for the purposes of the present study. An estimate of item validities revealed a sharp break in the degree of significance among the items. A number of items revealed little or no significance, while a greater number of them were highly significant, sufficiently so to validate the instrument's use for the purpose of the present study.

The relationship of school rankings on both forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide to the initial ranking of schools by supervisors proved highly significant. The relationship of the school rankings on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to the initial school rankings of the supervisors assumed no statistical significance. This would imply that while both instruments assess comparable factors, the TRG, in this instance, more nearly measures the elements of staff morale considered important by supervisors and teachers. A further investigation into the possibilities of the Guide's contribution in the area of "staff morale" should be included in some future research utilizing this instrument.

Another sub-problem involved the evaluation of the relationship of two methods of scoring used to score the instruments. The reliability

of the specimen scoring procedure and that of the traditional scoring procedure proved comparable and highly reliable. This finding will have merit for future research in numerous areas.

The relationship between the two forms of the Tennessee Rating Guide and the sixty-six item modification of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire proved significant. Possible further research utilizing these instruments should include a sampling of schools and administrators over a much wider geographic area. It would seem feasible to include in such research secondary schools and principals as well as elementary. There is a possibility that this research would further verify the usefulness of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form III, as a valuable correlate to be used with the Tennessee Rating Guide in assessing circumstances and behaviors which comprise the organizational climate of a school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Anderson, Vernon E. Principles and Procedures of Curriculum Improvement. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956.

Campbell, Roald F. and Russell T. Gregg (eds.). Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1954.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Ghiselli, Edwin E. and Clarence W. Brown. Personnel and Industrial Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948.

Goals for Americans. The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Griffiths, Daniel. Human Relations in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1956.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. First edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1942.

_____. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.

Gulliksen, Harold. Theory of Mental Tests. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated, 1950.

Hall, G. Stanley. Morale, the Supreme Standard of Life and Conduct. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1920.

Hocking, William E. Morale and Its Enemies. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918.

Hughes, James M. Human Relations in Educational Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.

Lindzey, Gardner (ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. II. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954.

MacCurdy, J. T. The Structure of Morale. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.

Nash, Jay B. Building Morale. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1942.

Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Roy, Robert H. The Administrative Process. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1958.

Stogdill, Ralph M. Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Viteles, Morris S. Motivation and Morale in Industry. New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., 1953.

Watson, Goodwin (ed.). Civilian Morale. Second Yearbook of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1942.

B. PERIODICALS

Baehr, M. E. and Richard Renck. "The Definition and Measurement of Employee Morale," Administrative Science Quarterly, III (September, 1958).

Brayfield, A. H. and W. H. Crockett. "Employee Attitudes and Employee Performance," Psychological Bulletin, LII (1955), 396-424.

Cornell, Francis G. "Socially Perceptive Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVI (March, 1955), 219-23.

Critzer, Leon A. and Ralph W. Backman. "How May the Principal and the Faculty Promote Wholesome School Morale?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XL (April, 1956), 234-35.

Ebel, Robert L. "Estimation of the Reliability of Ratings," Psychometrika, XVI (January-December, 1951), 407-24.

Faulk, Harry R. "Improving Staff Morale," Overview, III (February, 1962).

Freehill, Maurice F. and J. Alan Ross. "The Elementary School Principal As Others See Him," The Elementary School Journal, LXI (October, 1960), 35-40.

Gragg, W. L. "Teacher Morale," Clearing House, XXIX (April, 1955), 494.

Hand, Harold C. "What Makes for High Teacher Morale?" Educational Leadership, V (January, 1948), 279-80.

Harap, Henry. "Morale," Nations Schools, LXIII (June, 1949), 55-57.

Hedlund, Paul A. and Foster H. Brown. "Conditions That Lower Teacher Morale," Nations Schools, XLVIII (September, 1951), 40-42.

Jones, James J. "Teacher Morale and Administration," Clearing House, XXXII (January, 1958), 291.

Kelley, T. L. "The Selection of Upper and Lower Groups for the Validation of Test Items," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXX (January, 1939), 17-24.

Kirkpatrick, James J. and Edward E. Cureton. "Simplified Tables for Item Analysis," Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIV (Winter, 1954), 709-14.

Kurtz, Le R. H. "The Morale Function of the Executive," Personnel, XX (April, 1944), 202-20.

Lindner, Ivan H. "The Secondary School Principal and Staff Morale," The American School Board Journal, CXXXI (April, 1957), 25-27.

Lowe, Joe. "5 Steps to Staff Morale," School Executive, LXXXIV (September, 1954), 54.

McKimmie, Alexander A., Jr. "In What Ways May the Principal and the Faculty Promote Wholesome School Morale?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLI (April, 1957), 39-43.

Miller, George E. "What Is the Role of the Principal in Promoting Good Relationships With and Among the Staff?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIV (April, 1960), 19.

Satlow, David. "What Is Your Departmental MQ (Morale Quotient)?" Journal of Educational Sociology, XXVII (March, 1954), 329-32.

Shilland, P. D. "Teacher Morale Survey," Educational Forum, XIII (May, 1949), 479-86.

Silverman, Martin. "Principals--What Are You Doing to Teacher Morale?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIII (March, 1957), 204-10.

C. LETTERS

Letter from Andrew W. Halpin, University of Utah, to Orin B. Graff, The University of Tennessee, April 14, 1961.

Letter from Andrew W. Halpin, University of Utah, to Robert B. Smawley, The University of Tennessee, April 27, 1961.

D. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Projects Initiated Under the Cooperative Research Branch, July 1, 1956-September 30, 1960. No. 543. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

The University of Tennessee, College of Education, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision. "Characteristics of School Administrators." Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, 1959.

E. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Byrnes, Arthur F. "A Study of Job Satisfactions and Dissatisfactions of Teachers in Selected Schools of Indiana." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York, 1951.

Coker, Phyllis U. "A Study of the Use of the Tennessee Rating Guide As a Means of Differentiating Between Effective and Ineffective School Administrators." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1956.

Halpin, Andrew W. and Don B. Croft. "The Organizational Climate of Schools." Unpublished research report performed at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pursuant to Contract SAE 543[8639] with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962.

Noble, Warren V. "A Study of School Personnel Factors Which Teachers Believe Affect Teacher Morale in One School System." Unpublished Project C Report for doctor's degree, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1959.

O'Connor, William F., Jr. "A Study of Some Selected Factors Related to Teacher Morale." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, New York, 1958.

Padgug, Jacob B. "Leader Behavior of the Principal and Staff Morale." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1959.

Shipnuck, Murray E. "Perceived Hostility in Administrator-Teacher Relationships." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1954.

Smith, Wilbur. "Administrative Policies and Practices and Their Relation to Teaching Efficiency." Unpublished Project C Report for doctoral degree, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1953.

Smawley, Robert B. "Typal Sets and Syndromes of Administrative Behavior." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1961.

Thompson, J. D. "A Model for Viewing Organizational Conflict." Paper read at the University of North Carolina Research Seminar, Raleigh, North Carolina, April 11, 1961.

Whitlock, Gerald H. "The Application of Psychophysical Law to Performance Evaluation." Paper read before the Southern Society of Philosophy and Psychology, Atlanta, Georgia, March, 1961.

_____. "The Status of Morale Measurement, 1959." San Antonio, Texas: Personnel Laboratory, Wright Air Development Division, Air Research and Development Command, USAF, Lackland AFB, June, 1960.

_____, and E. E. Cureton. "Validation of Morale and Attitude Scales." San Antonio, Texas: Personnel Laboratory, Wright Air Development Division, Air Research and Development Command, USAF, Lackland AFB, June, 1960.

APPENDIX

TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE

(1961 EDITION)

Characteristics of Educational Administrators

_____

(Person being rated)

PLEASE PLACE AN (X) ON ONE OF THE FOUR PERCEIVED DEGREES

Characteristics to Consider	Slightly		Quite	Extremely
1. Is friendly and sociable?	____	____	____	____
2. Is skillful in stimulating others to achieve and share responsibility?	____	____	____	____
3. Is skillful getting policy-decisions made cooperatively?	____	____	____	____
4. Is group-minded in problem analysis toward consensus?	____	____	____	____
5. Is open to new data and progress?	____	____	____	____
6. Is intelligent and perceptive in problem analysis?	____	____	____	____
7. Is consistent, dependable, and predictable?	____	____	____	____
8. Is inclined to experiment after careful planning?	____	____	____	____
9. Is honest about his own biases and viewpoints?	____	____	____	____

Note: Please do not rate/check those considerations which you have had no opportunity to observe of the ratee.

TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE, 1961 EDITION (continued)

Characteristics to Consider	Slightly		Quite	Extremely
10. Is mindful of past errors, profits from experience?	____	____	____	____
11. Is objective in evaluating people?	____	____	____	____
12. Is efficient and practical in energy/time budgeting?	____	____	____	____
13. Is stable "under fire," inspires others' confidence?	____	____	____	____
14. Puts personal principles above personal gain?	____	____	____	____
15. Is trustworthy in dealings with people?	____	____	____	____
16. Is clear and expressive in speaking?	____	____	____	____
17. Is a keen and attentive listener?	____	____	____	____
18. Stimulates others to examine ideas and to seek solutions?	____	____	____	____
19. Is well informed of current affairs and trends?	____	____	____	____
20. Is active in community and public life?	____	____	____	____
21. Is an effective (or potentially effective) administrator?	____	____	____	____

Note: Please do not rate/check those considerations which you have had no opportunity to observe of the ratee.

TENNESSEE RATING GUIDE: ADJECTIVAL CHECKLIST

Instructions: Below are twenty-five sets of opposing adjectival terms. Each set is a scale offering four degrees. Evaluate the ratee on each as:

example: If you perceive the ratee to be extremely talkative, you would place an (x) at the indicated degree below.

talkative x : : : quiet

_____
(Person being rated)

courageous	:	:	:	cowardly
open-minded	:	:	:	closed-minded
creative	:	:	:	obstructive
stable	:	:	:	unstable
considerate	:	:	:	inconsiderate
efficient	:	:	:	inefficient
friendly	:	:	:	unfriendly
practical	:	:	:	impractical
intelligent	:	:	:	unintelligent
careful	:	:	:	careless
sociable	:	:	:	shy
consistent	:	:	:	inconsistent
trustworthy	:	:	:	untrustworthy
expressive	:	:	:	"blank"
clear	:	:	:	confusing
attentive	:	:	:	inattentive
well-informed	:	:	:	narrowly-informed
public-active	:	:	:	public-passive
progressive	:	:	:	regressive
objective	:	:	:	subjective
group-mindful	:	:	:	group-indifferent
stimulative	:	:	:	discouraging
democratic	:	:	:	autocratic
perceptive	:	:	:	"blind"
honest	:	:	:	dishonest

Note: Please fill out this adjectival checklist form before applying the attached descriptive rating guide.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION ITEMS

(OCDQ, FORM III)

1. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.
2. The principal schedules the work for the teachers.
3. Teachers prepare attendance reports during class time.
4. The principal is easy to understand.
5. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.
6. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions.
7. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.
8. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.
9. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.
10. Schedule changes are posted conspicuously at this school.
11. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.
12. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.
13. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.
14. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.
15. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.
16. The principal does personal favors for teachers.
17. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.
18. The principal talks a great deal.
19. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.
20. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.
21. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.
22. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.

23. In faculty meetings the principal talks just to "fill in time."
24. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.
25. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.
26. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference.
27. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.
28. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
29. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.
30. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.
31. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.
32. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.
33. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.
34. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.
35. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.
36. The principal gets teachers' approval before making new policies.
37. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms.
38. Teachers waste little time in faculty meetings.
39. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.
40. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.
41. Extra books are available for classroom use.
42. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.
43. The morale of the teachers is high.
44. The principal checks the subject matter ability of teachers.
45. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.
46. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.
47. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.

48. The principal clarifies wrong ideas a teacher may have.

49. Custodial service is available when needed.

50. Teachers see the principal after school to get help with class problems.

51. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.

52. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.

53. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use.

54. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work.

55. In faculty meetings there is the feeling of "let's get things done."

56. The principal criticizes a specific act rather than a staff member.

57. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.

58. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.

59. The principal takes the blame when parents criticize teachers.

60. The principal uses constructive criticism.

61. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.

62. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.

63. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.

64. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.

65. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.

66. Teachers are stimulated to work by talks with the principal.

67. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.

68. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.

69. Student progress reports require too much work.

70. The principal certainly does a lot of work around here.

71. Teachers leave the building as soon as possible at day's end.

72. The principal visits the classrooms at this school.

73. Teachers have too many committee requirements.

74. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.

75. Teachers engage in many outside activities.

76. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.

77. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.

78. Grading practices are standardized at this school.

79. Teachers use all their sick leave.

80. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.

FORMAT OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE, FORM III

IBM CARD
MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Printed below is an example of a typical item found in the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire.

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

	1	2	3	4
Teachers call each other by their first names.	○	○	●	○

In this example the respondent marked alternative 3 to indicate that the interpersonal relationship described in the item "often occurs" at his school. Of course, any other alternative could be selected depending upon how often the behavior described occurs in your school.

Please make your IBM pencil marks look heavy and dark like the example. Try to stay within the lines. This method will facilitate the machine processing of the IBM card. PLEASE MARK EVERY ITEM.

ITEMS ARE PRINTED ON BOTH SIDES OF THE CARD.

Thank you

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

5

	1	2	3	4
Extra books are available for classroom use.	○	○	○	○
The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.	○	○	○	○
The morale of the teachers is high.	○	○	○	○
The principal checks the subject matter ability of teachers.	○	○	○	○
School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.	○	○	○	○
The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.	○	○	○	○
Teachers at this school show much school spirit.	○	○	○	○
The principal clarifies wrong ideas a teacher may have.	○	○	○	○
Custodial service is available when needed.	○	○	○	○

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION ITEMS (MODIFICATION OF FORM III)*

- 1. Teachers prepare attendance reports during class time.
2. The principal is easy to understand.
- 3. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions.
- 4. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.
5. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.
6. Schedule changes are posted conspicuously at this school.
- 7. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.
8. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.
9. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.
-10. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.
-11. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.
-12. The principal talks a great deal.
-13. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.
14. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.
15. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.
16. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.
-17. In faculty meetings the principal talks just to "fill in time."
18. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.
19. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.
-20. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.
21. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
-22. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.
-23. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.

24. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.

-25. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.

-26. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.

-27. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.

28. The principal gets teachers' approval before making new policies.

-29. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms.

30. Teachers waste little time in faculty meetings.

-31. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.

-32. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.

33. Extra books are available for classroom use.

34. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.

35. The morale of the teachers is high.

36. The principal checks the subject matter ability of teachers.

37. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.

38. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.

39. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.

40. The principal clarifies wrong ideas a teacher may have.

41. Custodial service is available when needed.

42. Teachers see the principal after school to get help with class problems.

43. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.

44. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.

45. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use.

46. In faculty meetings there is the feeling of "let's get things done."

47. The principal criticizes a specific act rather than a staff member.

48. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.

49. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.

50. The principal uses constructive criticism.

-51. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.

52. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.

53. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.

54. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.

55. Teachers are stimulated to work by talks with the principal.

56. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.

-57. Student progress reports require too much work.

58. The principal certainly does a lot of work around here.

-59. Teachers leave the building as soon as possible at day's end.

60. The principal visits the classrooms at this school.

-61. Teachers have too many committee requirements.

62. Teachers engage in many outside activities.

63. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.

-64. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.

-65. Teachers use all their sick leave.

-66. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.

*Items preceded by a minus (-) indicate negative items.

OCDQ ITEMS THAT COMPOSE FOUR SUBTESTS: TEACHERS' BEHAVIOR

I - DISENGAGEMENT

Form IV	Form III	
2	19	The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.
6	35	There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.
10	27	Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.
14	39	Teachers seek special favors from the principal.
18	15	Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.
22	7	Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.
26	11	Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.
30	33	Teachers at this school stay by themselves.
61	40	Teachers talk about leaving the school system.
38	31	Teachers socialize together in small select groups.

II - HINDRANCE

24	77	Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.
20	73	Teachers have too many committee requirements.
16	69	Student progress reports require too much work.
12	61	Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.
- 8	65	Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.
- 4	57	Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.

III - ESPRIT

35	43	The morale of the teachers is high.
31	51	The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.
27	47	Teachers at this school show much school spirit.
23	49	Custodial service is available when needed.
19	63	Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.
15	45	School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.
21	21	There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.
11	55	In faculty meetings there is the feeling of "let's get things done."
7	41	Extra books are available for classroom use.
3	67	Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.

IV - INTIMACY

Form IV	Form III	
1	5	Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.
5	13	Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.
9	1	Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.
13	9	Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.
17	17	Teachers have fun socializing together during school.
57	25	Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.
-25	29	Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.

OCDQ ITEMS THAT COMPOSE FOUR SUBTESTS: PRINCIPAL'S BEHAVIOR

V - ALOOFNESS

58	34	Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.
59	30	Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.
55	26	The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference.
44	80	Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.
34	37	Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms.
52	14	The rules set by the principal are never questioned.
40	68	Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.
-54	53	School secretarial service is available for teachers' use.
-64	76	Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.

VI - PRODUCTION EMPHASIS

39	6	The principal makes all class scheduling decisions.
43	2	The principal schedules the work for the teachers.
62	44	The principal checks the subject matter ability of teachers.
47	64	The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.
66	22	The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.
51	74	Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.
48	18	The principal talks a great deal.

VII - THRUST

Form IV	Form III	
28	12	The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.
32	62	The principal sets an example by working hard himself.
36	60	The principal uses constructive criticism.
41	8	The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.
49	52	The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.
53	28	The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
56	58	The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.
60	46	The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.
63	4	The principal is easy to understand.

VIII - CONSIDERATION

29	20	The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.
33	16	The principal does personal favors for teachers.
37	54	The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work.
42	24	The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.
46	32	Teachers help select which courses will be taught.
50	42	The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.

OCDQ SUBTESTS*

Teachers' Behavior

I. Disengagement indicates that the teachers do not work well together. They pull in different directions with respect to the task; they gripe and bicker among themselves.

II. Hindrance refers to the teachers' feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary busy work.

III. Esprit refers to "morale." The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.

IV. Intimacy refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other.

Principal's Behavior

V. Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He "goes by the book" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal with the teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation.

VI. Production Emphasis refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive and task-oriented.

VII. Thrust refers to behavior marked not by close supervision of the teachers, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through the example which he personally sets. He does not ask the teachers to give of themselves any more than he willingly gives of himself; his behavior, though starkly task-oriented, is nonetheless viewed favorably by the teachers.

VIII. Consideration refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teachers "humanly," to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms.

---

*Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools" (unpublished research report performed at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, pursuant to Contract No. SAE 543[8639] with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962).